REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 463 48

BESTOWING THE GIFT OF TONGUES--A HISTORY OF THE FIRST 2 YEARS OF OPERATION OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE PROGRAM.

BY- BEATTIE, ARTHUR H.

MIDDLEBURY COLL., VT.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-8761 PUB DATE MAR 61

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, TUCSON

CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8761

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.24 131P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, *LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, *HISTORICAL REVIEWS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, COLLEGE PROGRAMS, MODERN LANGUAGES, TUCSON, ARIZONA

THE BACKGROUND, ESTABLISHMENT PROCEDURES, AND WORKING ACTIVITIES OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE PROGRAM WERE PRESENTED AS WELL AS AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL SUCCESS OF THE PROGRAM. COLLEGE LANGUAGE CENTERS WERE SET UP ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO TEACH LANGUAGES DESIGNATED AS IMPORTANT. ALONG WITH THESE CENTERS, THE INSTITUTE PROGRAM WAS ESTABLISHED FOR ADVANCED TRAINING OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES. DURING THE INSTITUTE PROGRAM'S FIRST 2 YEARS OF OPERATION, 49 SUMMER AND 9 FULL-YEAR INSTITUTES WERE CONDUCTED, TRAINING OVER 3,000 TEACHERS. TRAINING WAS OFFERED IN FRENCH, SPANISH, GERMAN, RUSSIAN, AND ITALIAN. FACTORS LEADING TO THE VARYING DEGREES OF SUCCESS OF THESE INSTITUTES ARE OUTLINED IN THE REPORT. (JH)

ED010463

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

BESTOWING THE
GIFT OF TONGUES

A history of the first two years of operation
of the Foreign Language Institute Program,
under the National Defense Education Act
of 1958

Prepared for the U. S. Office of Education
under Contract No. SAE-8761
with Middlebury College

by

Arthur H. Beattie
The University of Arizona
March, 1961

BESTOWING THE GIFT OF TONGUES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

The Background for the Program .... page 3

Chapter II

The Establishment of the Program........ page 31

Chapter III

An Analysis of the Program .... page 49

Chapter IV

An Evaluation of the Program .... page 81

* * * * * * * * * *

Table I -- Summer Institutes, 1959............. page 118
Table II -- Academic-Year Institutes, 1959-60 .... page 120
Table III -- Summer Institutes, 1960 .... page 121
Table IV -- Academic-Year Institutes, 1960-61 .... page 126
Table V -- Enrollments by Languages and Levels .... page 127
Table VI -- Evaluation Survey Teams .... page 128

Chapter I

THE BACKGROUND FOR THE PROGRAM

SCANT ATTENTION TO LANGUAGE STUDY IN U.S.

The United States of America has long had the unenviable distinction of devoting in its educational programs far less attention to foreign language study than any other major nation in the world. Statistical charts published on the eve of the adoption of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 show Ceylon and Iraq providing for an unbroken sequence of ten years of foreign language study for every student continuing his education through the secondary school system. Egypt and West Germany come next with nine years; Austria, Mexico, and Yugoslavia require eight years of continuous language study; France, Spain, and Turkey follow with a minimum of seven years. Argentina is the one country of the 35 included in the comparison which seems to rank below the United States, but this ranking is quite misleading for Argentina specifically requires several years of foreign language study of every student in a secondary school, whereas in our country language study is optional and in most schools no opportunity is offered for more than two years' work in this field.

1958 ENROLLMENT FIGURES

The Modern Language Association of America has recently published statistics concerning foreign language offerings and enrollments in our public secondary schools as of the fall of 1958. The comparison with 1954, the last preceding year for which similar statistics were gathered, is encouraging, for it shows foreign language teaching in a significantly stronger position. It must be noted, however, that still approximately half our public high schools (49.6 per cent) offer no opportunity whatever for training in a modern foreign language, and that only 16.5 per cent of our total high school population was, in the semester in question, engaged in the study of a foreign tongue. Nowhere in a major country is the introduction of foreign languages in the school curriculum deferred so long as here in America, and nowhere is so little time devoted to the subject. It is small wonder if our population is deficient in the ability to speak or read any language other than English.

LANGUAGE STUDY IN RUSSIA

Far from being odious, comparisons are essential and salutary. It is well for Americans to note that in the basic ten-year schools of the Soviet Union all students study a foreign language for six years. In addition to these regular schools, Russia has special language schools as well, in the upper grades of which all instruction, whether in mathematics, history, or any other subject, is conducted entirely in the particular foreign tongue of the school. All Russian university students are required to study a second foreign language, which must be that of one of the peoples of Asia or Africa. Americans might well observe, too, that while a great number of languages are taught in Russia, major emphasis is placed upon our own. In the secondary schools of the USSR, 40 per cent of the pupils study English, and in the universities 60 per cent of the students are learning it.

OUR LIMITED OFFERINGS It is, then, undeniable that, as a nation, we continue to neglect foreign language instruction. Normally those of our children who do study a foreign language do not begin it until adolescence, when speech habits are more or less fixed and imitative powers less keen than among youngsters of eight or nine years of age. Most commonly we make available only two years of instruction in a language, a woefully inadequate time for the development of proficiency. Where other nations provide for several years' study of two or more tongues of the world of today, with few exceptions we offer to a rather small proportion of our students a quite insufficient introduction to only one.

DISTRUST OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES In the period between the two world wars many complacent Americans firmly believed that the Atlantic and the Pacific effectively isolated us from Europe and Asia, and permitted us to pay little heed to the rest of the world. They held that Americans had no real need to know any language other than English, and that indeed one of our citizens who spoke a foreign tongue was to be viewed with suspicion. Some doubtless felt that, since English was the language of the one-hundred-per-cent American, to speak another language was in itself evidence of disloyalty. The Melting Pot tended to destroy the rich cultural heritage (including a command of the language of their parents) of Americans of Polish, German, Scandinavian, or Italian descent, to mention only a few of the major ethnic groups represented in the population of the United States.

WAR REVEALS NEED FOR LANGUAGES

World War II shook America out of its smug complacency. It was not true that our citizens had no occasion to travel outside our shores. In the four-year period between the assault on Pearl Harbor and the end of 1945, approximately eleven and a half million young Americans were called upon to serve abroad. Again between 1950 and 1953, between three and four million went overseas during the police action in Korea. It would appear that for the foreseeable future, even without any major conflict breaking out somewhere on the surface of the globe, young Americans in great numbers will perform military service in distant areas of the world. Much of this service, we sincerely hope, will be of a peacetime nature among friends and allies. The need of the military for translators and interpreters is obvious, but greater still is the contribution to good will and understanding by enlisted men and officers who can do something more than gesticulate and smile in their effort to communicate with the population among whom they symbolize and represent the United States of America. In the event of war--and we live in the constant shadow of towering intercontinental missiles armed with atomic warheads--a knowledge of languages may well be as essential for survival as the possession of the latest in submarine and stratospheric craft, or in weapons of destruction and defense. No one can say just which of the hundreds of languages of the world may be of strategic military importance some day in the near future, but there can be no question about the grim necessity of our having available specialists in even the least familiar of languages much as we maintain stockpiles of essential metals and other potentially important materials.

NEED FOR LANGUAGES OF FOES AND ALLIES

In wartime, the languages of foes and of allies are doubtless of equal importance. As the memoirs of numerous military leaders reveal, the failure to speak the same language leads to confusion, bitterness, and tragic misunderstandings at the level of an allied high command. A failure in the field to understand the language of an ally can have equally tragic, if less widespread, consequences. An observer has told of an American battalion in Korea which advanced into an enemy ambush in spite of the warnings of a shouting, gesticulating native whom no one could understand. It is a sad commentary upon America's universal public education, in which French has traditionally been the most commonly taught foreign language, that a careful screening of 100,000 men recently landed in 1944 on the shores of Normandy revealed fewer than 20 who could make a reliable translation of even a French newspaper, not to mention more technical material such as legal documents, or who could carry on a simple negotiation with local military or civilian authorities. It is not difficult to imagine what the situation would have been if, instead of French, the language involved had been one of those taught only rarely, or not at all, in the schools of the United States.

THE LANGUAGE CURTAIN IN DIPLOMACY

That foreign languages have a military importance to our nation is obvious, but this is of course not their sole, nor even their principal importance. Numerous events of the immediate past have impressed upon the American public how readily a lack of language understanding can jeopardize the effectiveness of diplomatic ventures, foreign-aid programs, trade missions, and cultural and educational undertakings abroad. The best-selling novel The Ugly American may have been unfair in its cruel underlining of the ineptness and inefficiency of certain of this country's official representatives in the Orient who could speak no language other than English, but at least it focused American public attention upon a problem becoming increasingly acute as the United States seeks to play its new rôle of world leader upon a globe in which there are no longer any distant lands. The speed of jet travel has brought Paris, Moscow, Tokyo, New Delhi, or Djakarta closer in travel time to New York or San Francisco than was many an American farm to the county seat just two generations ago. There can be no doubting the truth of the declaration by John Foster Dulles that interpreters cannot provide an adequate substitute for a real understanding of the other man's language if we wish a basis for mutual esteem and common action. "It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language," he declared, "and without understanding their language it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds." The Language Curtain must take its place among obstacles to mutual comprehension and respect among nations along with the more widely publicized Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

LANGUAGES AND BUSINESS

In the new world in which Americans now live, foreign languages have acquired, then, a key importance for numerous governmental programs; at the same time, they grow increasingly significant for business. Over 100,000 Americans now work abroad, in trade and industry, and the number is increasing rapidly. It is no insignificant proportion of our present high school population that will one day be employed in other lands. Increasingly experience demonstrates that the monolingual American businessman abroad, unable or unwilling to adapt to the cultural patterns of the people among whom he resides, will lose out to the representative of some other country who not only speaks the language of his clients but lives among them and shares their customs. It is not from the comfortable isolation of an English-speaking American colony in a foreign capital that one can hope to do business effectively as the agent of an American firm abroad. We have learned to our own cost that in trade, as in diplomacy, we can no longer expect the other fellow to learn our language and to employ it in his dealings with us. Our linguistic naïveté has cost us business, influence, and good will.

TODAY'S STUDENT WILL PROBABLY TRAVEL ABROAD

The shrinking of the globe has led to greatly increased travel, and therefore to a multiplying of opportunities to use foreign languages. It may have been defensible 30 years ago to argue that American high school students would probably never have occasion to travel outside the borders of their own country; today, on the contrary, the chances are that they will spend considerable time abroad. There are currently 80,000 young Americans engaged in study in other lands. It seems generally agreed that there is no better basis for building international understanding than by an ample exchange of students. There is, then, every reason to hope for a great expansion in the number of our young people going abroad to continue their studies. It is only realistic, however, to point out that a large proportion of our students seeking to study outside the United States are shockingly ill-prepared linguistically to profit from the enriching cultural experience made available to them. In addition to the thousands of Americans who visit other lands as students, there are the millions who travel abroad as tourists. We now spend over one and a half billion dollars annually for foreign travel. The notion that Americans have no occasion to use foreign languages must surely be recognized as a myth today.

LANGUAGES AND RAPID COMMUNICATION

Mention has been made of the development of rapid means of travel as one factor contributing to a need for a greater knowledge in our day of foreign languages. Indeed, as more and more fast planes of many nations converge on overcrowded airports, one cannot help but wonder if certain accidents may not be due to the failure of officials in the control tower and pilots in the air to comprehend one another--due, that is, to what has been dubbed "the intersonic barrier." In addition to ever speedier travel, other means of communication contribute to the expanding opportunities for Americans to make effective use of a knowledge of one or more foreign tongues. Americans are seeing more foreign films than ever before. Soon, undoubtedly, worldwide television will be a reality. Our people are attending more concerts and finding the opportunity to meet, at home, more artists from abroad, in all the fields of the arts, than at any previous time in our history. A sort of cultural renaissance, added to the pressing needs of defense, diplomacy, and business, contributes to the expansion of opportunities for our citizens to make a useful and rewarding application of their knowledge of foreign languages.

SOURCE OF AMERICA'S NEGLECT OF LANGUAGE STUDY

If America's needs for foreign languages are so great, why are the programs of our schools so inadequate to meet them? The answer is not a simple one, but it is to be sought primarily in a philosophy of education dominant in the period between the two world wars. The anti-language bias of the policies of public education of the third and fourth decades of the century was, strangely enough, reinforced by certain findings and pronouncements of representatives of the language teachers themselves, distorted and applied, no doubt, in a way their authors had not foreseen.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF 1920's AND 30's

At the beginning of the period in question, secondary education had become well-nigh universal for American youth. It was not a select group of students entering our high schools, but virtually the totality of our boys and girls of about the age of fourteen. A democratization of programs was necessary. There can be (indeed there has been and continues to be) debate about the form that democratization took. No generalization about American public education can ever be entirely accurate, for we have fifty state departments of education, and within each state innumerable semi-autonomous local systems whose independence the American public wishes jealously to guard. Recognizing that numerous schools offer striking exceptions to the general pattern, it is still safe to say that, by and large, in American secondary education in the nineteen twenties and thirties there was a marked tendency to de-emphasize subjects considered too difficult for the average child (foreign language and mathematics were commonly placed in this category) and to substitute new courses in the area of the social studies whose purpose was to prepare the youngsters to adjust to life within the family, the social group, and the nation.

THE COLEMAN REPORT

In 1924, generous grants from the Carnegie Corporation permitted the inauguration of "The Modern Foreign Language Study." Lasting for a period of five years, this thorough survey of the teaching of foreign languages in the United States and Canada produced over a dozen books. Hundreds of teachers were involved in the assembling of data for this study, and a laudable start was made at producing an accurate picture of the status of foreign language study in both countries. An effort was made, also, through word and idiom counts, to furnish a scientific basis for the preparation of language texts. The most influential product of the Study was the controversial volume commonly known as "The Coleman Report." Intended as a realistic attempt to salvage as much as possible out of an admittedly bad situation, this report actually served to weaken even further the precarious position of modern languages in American schools--a grim reminder of the disservice that realism can accomplish when it rejects entirely the vision of the ideal. It served to transform into standards of excellence what it reported as current practice, and influenced in a fashion quite adverse to the cause of language teaching the content of curricula, courses of study, directives to teachers, textbooks, and examinations for many years to come. Its influence is still strongly felt in the very situation that the National Defense Education Act, and the Foreign Language Institutes created under its terms, are seeking to correct.

READING-KNOWLEDGE OBJECTIVE

Noting that throughout the country two years was generally the maximum time allotted in most school programs to the study of a foreign language, Professor Algernon Coleman of the University of Chicago sought to determine how one might most effectively use such a limited period. It was clearly inadequate for the acquisition of the multiple skills of auditory comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing, plus the gaining of an insight into the culture of another people. His questionnaires having revealed that the vague and diffuse objectives of language teachers were not being met in the limited time available, he concluded that it would be best to seek to develop primarily one skill. He selected a reading knowledge as the skill most readily acquired under the conditions prevailing in American schools, and as, at the same time, the one most valuable to an American who would, obviously, have little occasion to encounter a foreign language except in books.

OPPOSITION TO THIS RESTRICTED OBJECTIVE

The conclusions of the report were by no means unanimously accepted by the committee of which Professor Coleman served as secretary. They were from the outset vigorously opposed by many of his fellow language teachers. By what perhaps should have been a predictable twist of fate, these findings concerning the current status of language teaching were quickly seized upon by those with administrative authority in school programs as recommendations for the ideal course of study. Thus came into being, with the aid of serious and well-intentioned specialists from among the language teachers themselves, the reign of the "reading-knowledge objective." It is ironical that before long one was to hear the complaint: "I studied French for two years in high school, but when I got to France I couldn't understand a word," for, in general, public education did not recognize as a major goal in its restricted language offerings the acquisition of skill in listening and speaking.

NOTEWORTHY EXCEPTIONS Widespread though it was, the "reading-knowledge objective" was far from being universally accepted. Many cities--Cleveland immediately comes to mind as one of these notewrothy exceptions--had, in the period between the two world wars, well-conceived and well-directed language programs in which the skills of comprehension and speaking were stressed. Fascinating experiments in direct-method, and modified direct-method teaching were in operation in many centers. Interesting textbooks representing novel approaches to active language teaching appeared. At the college level, undoubtedly the grammar-translation method prevailed. One encounters not infrequently college graduates who report that they never really heard spoken as a living tongue the language that they studied. This is true even of majors in a modern language, for advanced literature courses were, and apparently (to judge by recent statistics compiled by the Modern Language Association) still are taught in some institutions in English. But again, as at the secondary school level, the situation varied greatly from institution to institution. Many fine programs under dynamic teachers were offering training in the living language. Language summer schools were fairly numerous. Middlebury College was the pioneer in providing such summer programs which permitted advanced students and teachers in service to spend their vacation in highly intensive language study in an environment from which the use of English was banned completely. The very success of the Middlebury Summer Language Schools, and of other similar ventures, proves that they were filling a real need, and underlines the fact that in general the graduates of American colleges, and therefore the teachers of foreign languages in the nation's schools, were inadequately prepared in the spoken language. Only a few of the teachers of foreign languages, and those presumably from among the best prepared and most conscientious, gained the benefits to be derived from intensive programs of this sort within the country or abroad.

FOUNDATIONS LAID FOR STRUCTURAL LINGUISTICS

Outside the classrooms of foreign language teachers, significant studies were being made that are now beginning to exercise a profound influence on language teaching. A group of eager anthropologists and language specialists were helping to lay the foundations of the new science of structural linguistics by recording and analyzing the sound patterns, the structural forms, and the various devices by which meaning is conveyed, of numerous American Indian dialects. There was need for haste, for some at least of these dialects seemed destined to disappear rather rapidly, and the number of speakers available as models was dwindling. The American school of structural (or descriptive) linguistics grows directly out of the pioneer work in the Indian dialects, and in a number of "exotic" languages, of such men as Bloomfield, Boas, Sepir, and Whorf. Approaching the problem of language largely from the point of view of the anthropologist, free from the prejudices of traditional linguists who tend to apply to all languages rather rigid concepts derived from Latin grammar, they considered language as essentially a cultural phenomenon, as one of the major elements of the learned and shared behavior which in any culture is passed on to its members. They recognized that language so conceived is essentially spoken, and that, indeed, in many cultures it may not be written at all. Where a written language exists, as in the most frequently studied Western European cultures, it is in a sense a secondary language derived from the spoken one which it seeks, more or less accurately, to symbolize. It is indeed a symbolization of a symbolization--for the spoken word itself is a symbol of experience. The structural linguist urges that the proper point of departure for the analysis of any language ought to be the spoken tongue, even if one's eventual concern is to be with the language as it is written. The best and most accurate understanding of that written language is to be achieved, he will affirm, by means of an oral approach.

INTENSIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS Under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, and with the aid of financial grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, intensive programs of instruction in a number of rarely taught languages of Africa, the Orient, and the Pacific were established in a score of universities in 1941 and 1942. This program came into being largely through the energy and vision of Mortimer Graves of the American Council of Learned Societies and of J Milton Cowan, secretary of the Linguistic Society of America. Teaching materials were rapidly developed, and the technique of utilizing in language instruction the skills of a trained linguist teamed with one or more native informants was experimentally applied with considerable success. At the same time, dictionaries and accurate analyses of a number of the rarely taught languages were prepared.

ASTP LANGUAGE COURSES

The needs of a nation at war gave a further opportunity to the structural linguists to demonstrate the applicability of their principles to the teaching of European languages. In April, 1943, the Army Specialized Training Program was established, with courses of language and area study set up in 55 colleges across the nation. By December of that year, over 13,000 young men, selected for their intelligence and probable linguistic aptitude, were devoting their full time to the acquisition of one of the modern languages and to the study of the major elements of the culture of which it is an expression. The principal emphasis was placed upon the development of skills of auditory comprehension and speaking, for presumably the trainees were to serve as interpreters, as interrogators of prisoners of war, and as representatives of the U. S. Army in its dealings with the population of occupied or liberated regions. Popular magazines carried numerous articles about the miraculous "Army Method" which permitted the speedy acquisition of a new language and which, when adopted by the nation's schools, would enable them also to turn out fluent speakers with only a few months of study. These exaggerated claims were of course based on a quite incomplete knowledge of the Army program on the one hand, and on an unrealistic notion of the patterns of American public education on the other.

THE ARMY PROGRAM

It is undeniable that in nine months the ASTP produced a large number of men ready to perform the duties involving the use of a foreign language for which they had been trained. In itself, this was a revolutionary development in American education. It had been demonstrated that, placed in a situation favorable to the development of language skills, great numbers of American young men could rapidly progress toward fluency in a tongue other than their own. The oft-repeated claim that Americans, for one reason or another, could not learn languages was certainly effectively disproved. But there was in reality no "Army Method" which could be borrowed by the nation's schools and adapted to their needs. Rather than a method, the Army Specialized Training Program provided a concentration of effort on a single subject never before attempted on so large a scale in American education. In the nine months of study under this program, the trainee spent many more hours in language classes than does a college major in his four years of undergraduate training. In addition, the Army program had a limited objective. It put special emphasis on the skills of auditory comprehension and speaking, and gave little importance to the written language and to the literary studies which are properly a part of a college curriculum in a foreign language. It offered what many language teachers had long pleaded for--the opportunity to work with small classes of no more than ten students for effective oral exercises. It provided also for the hiring of numerous native speakers as informants in order to furnish the students an accurate model for speech patterns and pronunciation. In method (and it must be recalled that most of those who, in the nation's colleges, directed these programs and taught in them had no special training in structural linguistics) there was little that was strictly new; there was a new emphasis, but the teaching devices employed had long been used in courses, or portions of courses, having a comparable objective.

INFLUENCE OF ASTP

Though the situation prevailing in the classes of the Army Specialized Training Program could not be reproduced in high schools or colleges, there was a marked impact of the program upon civilian teaching. For one thing, it had permitted many teachers to taste the satisfaction to be experienced in observing students make rapid progress toward fluency in the spoken language. It had led, also, to the production of new textbooks with a new emphasis upon the patterns of the spoken tongue, and to the wider use of recorded materials. In some colleges, intensive courses meeting as many as ten hours a week were set up in order to approach the degree of concentration provided by the ASTP. Few of these intensive courses have survived, however, for American education is conservative in the matter of observing its traditional practices concerning courses, schedules, and credits. All in all, the influence of the nine months of the ASTP experiment was important, if not profound, in giving encouragement to teaching the spoken language and to the preparation of materials more adequate to that end than the traditional textbooks. It also contributed to a more favorable climate of opinion for increased emphasis upon language study.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF STRUCTURAL LINGUISTS

The energy and sense of mission of the structural linguists had other repercussions upon language study in America. They were instrumental in shaping the effective programs of the Navy and of the Army, including the highly intensive training in small classes at the Army Language School at Monterey, California. Across the continent, the State Department's Foreign Service Institute reflects the same influence. Just how much can be accomplished by the program of small classes and intensive laboratory exercises in the latter institute has been dramatically made clear in recent months. Mention was made earlier of the inadequate language training of members of the American diplomatic corps, a situation brought to the attention of the public by a best-selling novel of a few years ago. Public concern led to a concerted effort to overcome this weakness. In March of 1958, less than half the members of our Foreign Service had a speaking knowledge of a foreign language. Eighteen months later, after intensive training at the Institute in Washington and in classes held abroad, that figure had been reduced to 15 per cent. Training henceforth will be concentrated in Washington in small classes, meeting in the early morning, to prepare foreign service officers for their assignments before they go abroad. Recent tests in 26 languages show that now approximately one-quarter of our Foreign Service Officers merit a rating of "specialist", which means they are virtually bilingual; over a third attained a "professional rating", which indicates a good command of the language; another quarter had attained a "working knowledge" of the language. Americans can learn languages other than their own, and the public is becoming increasingly aware of the necessity of their so doing.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FL PROGRAM In June of 1952, a step of great significance in the history of language teaching in America was made. By a grant of $120,000, the Rockefeller Foundation enabled the Modern Language Association of America to establish its Foreign Language Program. A subsequent grant of $115,000 in 1954, and a grant of $50,000 by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1959, have permitted the continuance of this program, which has now become a permanent activity of the MLA and will be continued, on a smaller scale, in the future, financed by membership dues of the Association. It is interesting to note that of the eleven thousand members of the MLA the majority are in no wise directly involved in the teaching of foreign languages. This is a professional organization devoted to the encouragement of scholarship in modern languages and literatures; the majority of its members are associated with departments of English in colleges and universities. It is interesting to note, too, that the man who by his vision, energy, and devotion organized the program, got it under way, and supervised every step in its early phases--William Riley Parker, Secretary of the MLA, 1947-1955--is himself a Milton scholar. No one, however, is more concerned about our nation's need for persons trained in the languages and customs of other peoples, and no one has done more to try to strengthen the teaching of foreign languages in America. He has been followed in the Foreign Language Program by men who share his deep concern and who emulate him in giving themselves wholeheartedly to the cause. They have provided effective leadership in the campaign. They include Kenneth W. Mildenberger, by professional training a scholar in medieval English literature; George Winchester Stone, Jr., also in the field of English literature, who in 1956 replaced Dr. Parker as executive secretary of the association; Theodore Andersson, Archibald T. MacAllister, Donald D. Walsh, and numerous others who in one capacity or another have contributed to the profession's penetrating self-analysis, and to the formulation and execution of plans designed to assure a strengthening of foreign language teaching in this country.

PROBLEMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FL PROGRAM

The first efforts of the Foreign Language Program were directed toward achieving a complete and accurate picture of the current situation of language study in American schools from kindergarten to the graduate programs of universities. This in itself was a huge task. Numerous conferences of specialists were summoned to formulate plans, or to prepare statements of principle. Representatives of other disciplines were consulted also in an effort to learn more fully how the mind operates in learning a language, when language learning can most usefully be begun, and how it can best be achieved. The problem of communication with a widely-scattered profession, the majority of whose members did not belong to any regional or national association of foreign language teachers, was in part solved by encouraging the establishment of foreign language bulletins in each state, and by providing their editors with abundant notes on new developments for the widest possible dissemination.

An apparently minor aspect of language instruction--the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary grades--aroused such widespread popular enthusiasm that the MLA had to devote much time and thought to the FLES (Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools) movement, and soon produced a series of teaching guides for the beginning of language instruction in Grade Three and its continuation through the grade school years. Problems of course content and teaching techniques, of teacher training, of the purchase and use of electronic equipment for language laboratories, of coördination between the various levels of instruction, of the applications of linguistics to language instruction, and a host of other related topics, received consideration in the numerous conferences and work groups called together under the auspices of the FL Program of the MLA. A special Rockefeller Foundation grant of $40,500 permitted the preparation by a group of experienced teachers and textbook authors of a Spanish language manual in the "New Key" for use in college classes. Now, under contracts with the Office of Education, the MLA is engaged in the preparation of high school teaching materials for several languages, and batteries of tests to meausre progress in the audio-lingual skills which are at last being stressed, as well as in other aspects of the study of languages and cultures.

CHANGED CLIMATE OF OPINION Under the leadership of the MLA, the language teachers of America are slowly becoming aware of their strengths and their shortcomings, and they are seeking to prepare themselves better for their task and to employ more effective tools and methods. At the same time, the Foreign Language Program has won them an increased measure of support from the public, and a widespread recognition of the need for an early start in language study and for longer, uninterrupted sequences of instruction to permit the acquisition of the skills that will make of a foreign language a valuable tool in travel, trade, and government service, and the key to rewarding and enriching personal experience in penetrating deeply into the literature and culture of another people. No one dare claim that language study can eliminate conflicts and discord among peoples, but no one can deny, either, that language study can make a significant contribution toward understanding our neighbors in this world we live in and in which circumstances call us to play a rôle of leadership.

COMMISSIONER MCGRATH ON LANGUAGES

This historical introduction suggests somewhat the climate of opinion which led to the inclusion of programs for foreign languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It would be easy to quote hundreds of statements by prominent persons to illustrate that, following World War II and the Korean War, there was deep concern in America about the inadequate attention devoted to foreign language study, but this is unnecessary for the purpose of this review of the situation. Since the testimony of the convert is always of special interest and carries extra weight, it is of interest, however, to quote a statement which Earl J. McGrath, then the U. S. Commissioner of Education, made in May of 1952: "For some years I unwisely took the position that a foreign language did not constitute an indispensable element in a general educational program. This position, I am happy to say, I have reversed. I have now seen the light and I consider foreign languages a very important element in general education. . . . Only through the ability to use another language even modestly can one really become conscious of the full meaning of being a member of another nationality or cultural group. It is in our national interest to give as many of our citizens as possible the opportunity to gain these cultural insights. . . . Educators from the elementary school to the top levels of the university system ought to give immediate attention to this matter."

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER URGES LANGUAGE STUDY

One more quotation seems appropriate, since it is drawn from an address by the President of the United States, and precedes by only a few months the adoption of the National Defense Education Act. Speaking to the graduating midshipmen of the U. S. Naval Academy on June 4, 1958, President Eisenhower commented on the inadequate command of foreign languages by Americans in general, and urged his listeners to learn and make use of other tongues. "We are, indeed," he declared, "poor linguists. We are too much handicapped because so many of our people have failed to become knowledgeable in a language other than ours. Success in this will do much to improve human understanding in a world of great cultural diversity, and thus to strengthen our relationships with other peoples. This is one indispensable step towards a peaceful world! As men of character, intelligence, and conviction, with abundant privilege of traveling in many lands, you will have great opportunity to do a fruitful work in this regard."

SPUTNIK FEVER

On October 4, 1957, and again on November 3, a Soviet Sputnik was rocketed into outer space and went into orbit around the earth. The formidable explosions of the propellant not only put the space-satellites into orbit, but they also produced powerful reverberations in America. A rash of editorials in newspapers from coast to coast offered ominous warnings that Soviet scientists had taken the lead away from ours, and declared that Russian technical education had brought about this superiority. There were heard loud cries that our schools were deficient in the teaching of science, and a revolution in American education was called for to make it more strenuous, more exacting, so that it might produce scientists to equal in imagination and technical skill those of the USSR. Of course voices were raised, too, in equal volume, to defend American education as better-balanced, as producing more fully-rounded scholars and research workers in contrast to what were claimed to be the mere technologists of Russia. Whatever the merits or weaknesses of either case, it is clear that the nation was profoundly shaken by the Soviet success, and that certain basic tenets of American education, accepted rather placidly between 1920 and 1940, then debated after World War II, were now vigorously attacked. There reigned what might be characterized as "Sputnik Fever."

NDEA NOT BORN OF SPUTNIK FEVER

Within 11 months, on September 2, 1958, President Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act, making it Public Law 85-864. In passing the Act, the Congress had recognized that the defense and security of the nation are inseparably bound with education. One is tempted, considering only the calendar of events, to see in this measure a product of the "Sputnik Fever." This is, in reality, a quite mistaken view. It was not born of hysteria, and it does not represent a crash program to meet the challenge of a threatened Soviet technological superiority over the West. It is rather the product of several years of investigations and planning by the staff of the U. S. Office of Education, in concert with numerous experts in many fields of scholarship and educational administration. Undoubtedly Russian scientific triumphs helped create the favorable atmosphere which won acceptance for the measure, but they did not inspire it.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

The objectives of the Act are of a long-range nature, for it seeks to strengthen the nation economically and militarily, and to prepare it more effectively for its rôle of international leadership, by improving instruction in our schools, particularly in certain fields of strategic importance. The Act recognizes and safeguards the traditional state and local direction and control of educational policies. It offers, however, federal government assistance to strengthen local programs of instruction, particularly in such fields of vital national interest as science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. It seeks to encourage the identification of talented students and their possible entry into a teaching career. It aims at increasing the opportunities for advanced graduate study, and thus the preparation of qualified college teachers to take care of the swelling enrollments in the nation's institutions of higher learning. It fosters research and experimentation in the more effective utilization for educational purposes of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media. It assists the States to provide vocational education programs for the training of technicians and engineering assistants in many areas of special importance to the nation's economy or defense. It provides for assistance to the State education agencies in strengthening their organization and resources for compiling and analyzing statistical data as a basis for complete and accurate nationwide information about all aspects of education in the United States. Finally, in Title VI, it undertakes to foster language development through assisting in the establishment of Language and Area Centers, through the encouragement of pertinent research and surveys, and through the creation of Language Institutes.

LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

The Language and Area Centers are established through contracts with institutions of higher learning for the express purpose of teaching languages of strategic importance in which instruction is not regularly offered in this country, or only on a quite limited scale. The six languages accorded top priority are Arabic, Chinese, Hindustani, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian. Other languages taught in Centers receiving assistance under the terms of Title VI of the Act include Bengali, Burmese, Gujerati, Hebrew, Indonesian, Korean, Marathi, Persian, Siamese, Swahili, Tamil, Turkish, Vietnamese, and Yoruba; the list is not complete, but it suffices to indicate the range of offerings in languages of which some had never before been available for study in America. Fellowships are also provided for graduate students specializing in a priority language and preparing to enter college teaching or other service of a public nature.

LANGUAGE INSTITUTES Another section of Title VI authorizes the federal government to enter into contracts with colleges or universities for the establishment of institutes for the advanced training of teachers of modern foreign languages in elementary or secondary schools. These institutes may be short-term programs during the summer vacation, or year-long programs. Their purpose is to increase the command of the language on the part of the participating high school or elementary school teachers and to familiarize them with new teaching methods and instructional materials. The Act authorizes for this purpose the expenditure of $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years. It provides that teachers employed in public schools may receive a stipend of $75 per week during the period of their study in the Institute, and an additional $15 per week for each dependent.

It is the Language Institutes established under the terms of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act which will be considered in the remaining chapters of this study, now that the background of the program has been rapidly sketched.

Chapter II

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROGRAM

FUNCTION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dorsey Baynham, in an article in Saturday Review of February 18, 1961, provides a sketch of Sterling M. McMurrin, newly appointed U. S. Commissioner of Education, and comments on the functions of the Office of Education which Mr. McMurrin now heads. "No glamour agency," writes Mr. Baynham, "OE's function is solely one of service--to the states, to local communities, and to other government agencies--and any change in its daily routine is usually dictated by emergency. Then, given the means to perform, it can shine.

RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER NDEA

The passage of the National Defense Education Act provided for the Office of Education an opportunity to display its resourcefulness in meeting emergencies of unprecedented proportions. On the eve of the Act's adoption, Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston and a research assistant constituted the entire staff of foreign language personnel in the Office of Education. Now the Office faced the necessity of organizing numerous new foreign language programs involving aid to state and local school systems, fellowships, centers, research, institutes, and still other functions, for which the expenditure of millions of dollars had been authorized. The first step was clearly to find competent staff of proven vision and executive ability to lay the groundwork for the contracts which would have to be let, and to determine, within the framework of the Act, the principles and procedures to be followed.

LEADERSHIP FOR LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

In this emergency, the Office of Education turned to the organization which had been most active in evaluating the status of language teaching in the United States and in seeking remedies to strengthen it. Since the Modern Language Association had provided leadership for the Foreign Language Program, it was natural to turn to its past and present officers in the search for persons to direct the activities of the new Language Development Section within the Office of Education. William Riley Parker, who had recently left the post of Executive Secretary of the MLA in order to return to his teaching career, was the first Chief of the Language Development Section. For eight months he shuttled back and forth between the University of Indiana and Washington until Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Director of the MLA's FL Program, was brought in as his successor. The various activities of the Language Development Section have thus benefited from the executive experience of its two successive chiefs. Thanks to their association with the MLA, they have been able to make available to the Office of Education the crystallization of the thinking of the leaders of the language-teaching profession and of their colleagues in related fields who had contributed, through numerous conferences and discussion meetings, to the formulation of the principles and policies of the FL Program. The Chiefs of the Language Development Section have brought with them to put at the service of the federal government the richest possible background for dealing with the problems of instruction in foreign languages, and the widest possible acquaintance with the collective thinking of the profession.

SECTION PERSONNEL The personnel of the Language Development Section has been drawn almost exclusively from the ranks of foreign language teachers and scholars. It is not a staff of lifetime federal government office workers, but of established and respected language specialists who, as a service to their profession, have left temporarily the contemplative calm of the groves of academe to plunge into the hectic round of duties which characterize federal government offices. The present professional staff to organize, direct, and evaluate the multiple activities concerned with foreign languages numbers 24. On occasion, other members of the profession may be called in for brief periods as consultants, but this small staff handles all normal details of a vast and complicated program. Mr. Baynham was right in declaring that the Office of Education can meet brilliantly an emergency situation when it presents itself.

CANVASS OF COLLEGES One of the first duties of the Language Development Section, in so far as the Institute program is concerned, was to canvass the institutions of higher education of the nation in order to determine what resources in equipment and teaching staff were available for this new type of training for teachers already in service. An inquiry was addressed to the president of every college and university in the United States with an explanation of the program, and a registry form to be filled out if the institution wished to be given consideration in the negotiation of contracts for language institutes. The registration form called for a brief summary of the college's program of advanced foreign language offerings, and of its mechanical and electronic equipment to be used as aids in language instruction. By mid-December of 1958, more than 250 colleges and universities had registered.

INITIAL INSTITUTE CONTRACTS

The National Defense Education Act authorized the appropriation of more than $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 for the operation of language institutes, but only a small portion of this sum had actually been appropriated. The initial allocation of $400,000 permitted the establishment of only four pilot institutes for the summer of 1959. Contracts were entered into with the University of Colorado for an institute of 100 participants in the three languages French, German, and Spanish; with Louisiana State University for 80 participants in French and Spanish; with the University of Maine for 100 participants in the same languages as at Colorado; and with the University of Michigan for still another institute of 100 participants in four languages, for Russian was here included in the program.

ADDITIONAL INSTITUTES--SUMMER 1951

It was possible for these four institutes to announce early in the year their plans for a summer institute, and to invite applications from teachers of foreign languages. Several thousand applications were soon received from prospective participants for, from the outset, interest in the programs was keen. The Office of Education was in the meantime negotiating with still other colleges for summer institutes, but no contracts could be signed and no participants officially accepted until Congress voted additional funds. The spring months of 1959 were filled with feverish activity and tormenting worries for Lawrence Poston, Jr., of the University of Oklahoma, who from the outset has directed for the Office of Education the institute program, and for the prospective directors of additional institutes. It was not until May that supplementary funds were made available and contracts could be signed for eight additional short-term institutes. These were, with one exception, smaller than the original four institutes. The smallest, at the University of South Dakota, accommodated 33 participants; the largest, at the University of Washington, was comparable in size to those of Colorado and Maine. The eight colleges which completed their plans for a summer institute after the additional funds were made available in May were Colgate University, the University of Georgia, Hollins College, the University of Missouri, San Francisco State College, the University of South Dakota, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington.

SELECTION OF SITES

Various factors entered into the selection of these 12 sites for the summer institutes of 1959. In some instances, but by no means all, the previous operation of successful summer language programs and the existence of language houses were important considerations. The availability of competent personnel, and the coöperation of the administration in placing its facilities at the disposal of the institute, were also taken into account. The special needs of certain regions, as reflected in recent studies of foreign language teaching, were in some instances decisive factors. And of course geography could not be overlooked. The 12 institutes were so carefully distributed that except for Alaska and Hawaii there was no state which did not have an institute either within its own borders or in at least one immediately adjoining state.

APPLICATIONS FOR ADMISSION

Interest on the part of the nation's teachers of modern foreign languages was keen. Over 5,000 applications were received, but since approximately one-third of the applicants sought admission to more than one institute, the actual number of teachers involved was 3,510. The problems of coördination between the institutes in the processing of applications were of course compounded by the shortage of time. It was possible for the same applicant to be accepted by more than one institute, with the result that the institutes received more rejections than were anticipated from persons whom they had selected as participants. Even the alternates of one institute had sometimes been selected for attendance at another. In consequence a couple of institutes went into operation with one or two fewer participants than had been authorized.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

A total of 920 teachers of modern foreign languages participated in the summer institutes of 1959. The criteria used in the selection of participants varied somewhat from institution to institution, but basically the requirements included a bachelor's degree and a satisfactory college record. In most instances, a minimum of two years of study of the language was demanded. While the Act declares that the institutes are to be established for "individuals who are engaged in *or preparing to engage in* the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools," the prospective language teacher was to all intents and purposes ruled out by the admission requirements of the 12 institutes of 1959. At least three years' experience in the teaching of a modern foreign language was generally required, though a few exceptions were certainly made on this score.

FURTHER CRITERIA OF SELECTION

The participants selected were not necessarily the best prepared and most successful teachers. Since one objective of the program is to give language teachers an opportunity to improve their accuracy in understanding the language and their fluency in speaking it, some persons with a command of the tongue approaching that of a native were certainly passed over as having less need of the upgrading the institute could offer than did their colleagues whose preparation was less adequate. There were exceptions, but in general the applicant apparently too ill prepared to profit from the program, and the applicant so well prepared that he was already fluent, were likely to be rejected in the process of selection. In certain areas of the country, there was a quite special need to give training in the spoken language to teachers whose previous study of language was limited almost exclusively to grammar. The native or near-native speaker would have been out of place in an institute designed specifically to meet the needs of the average foreign language teacher of such a region.

AGE AND SEX AS FACTORS IN SELECTION

Age was not a major factor in selection, yet it certainly figured in some degree in determining the choice of participants. Quite naturally a selection committee would hesitate about choosing a teacher within a year or so of retirement on the ground that he would have only a limited opportunity to apply what he had learned, and to share with colleagues the benefits of his experience. The average age of applicants was almost exactly 40 years; the average age of participants was 37 years. It would appear, too, that men were to some degree favored over women. They constituted less than 44.5 per cent of the applicants, but more than 48.5 per cent of the participants. It is interesting to note that women far outnumbered men as applicants in French, and to a lesser extent in Spanish. They were definitely in the minority in the case of both German and Russian; indeed, in the latter language the ratio was approximately three men to one woman. As might be expected in the case of a language only recently introduced into our school programs, the teachers of Russian were significantly younger than their colleagues in other languages.

STIPENDS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

The number of applications from private school teachers was small. Only 123 sought admission. Of these, a high proportion were accepted, for 48 ultimately took part in the program. Some institutes were unable to fill all the places they had reserved for private school teachers. The reason is not hard to understand. Private schools are concentrated in certain sections of the nation, and are quite rare in other vast regions. In addition, stipends and allowances for dependents were available only to those teaching in public elementary or secondary schools. The private school teacher paid no tuition, but he did have to meet the costs of textbooks, supplies, and board and room, without the help of the stipend paid to those in public school systems. The average participant employed in a public school received a little less than one hundred dollars a week for the duration of the institute. This included his stipend of $75.00 plus $15.00 for each dependent. The average number of dependents was 1.5.

DISTRIBUTION BY LEVEL AND LANGUAGE

Naturally, too, the number of secondary teachers was much greater than that of elementary school teachers. Four of the 12 institutes provided programs for FLES teachers. A total of 59 participants from this level of instruction were enrolled in the program.

The division by languages closely approximated the ratio of enrollments in the nation's schools. French and Spanish were virtually equal, with 371 in one and 370 in the other. In German, 140 were enrolled, and in Russian 39.

EFFICIENCY OF OPERATION The amazing feature of the operation of the language institutes in the summer of 1959 is not that there were problems resulting from multiple applications and acceptances, and from the fact that two-thirds of the institutes could not be contracted for officially until May; it is rather that every institute opened on schedule with its faculty already on hand and its programs already organized, and that, in spite of difficulties with newly-installed electronic equipment and in spite of the nature of the instruction, different from what both the participants and their professors in the institutes had previously known, the program everywhere got under way on a full scale without delay and continued, on the whole, in a remarkably efficient manner. The evaluation of the program will be presented later, but it can be stated here in brief that those who observed its operation closely and produced an objective appraisal of it were struck by its overall effectiveness. It was also, all things considered, an economical program. A total of $1,043,499 was expended for the organization and operation of the summer institutes of 1959. This is an average cost per participant of $1134.13--not an excessive cost for giving a teacher who perhaps had never before heard a native speak the language he teaches a much improved command of his subject, and a sound introduction to the use of effective new methods, devices, and materials.

ACADEMIC-YEAR PROGRAMS The summer institutes of 1959 were followed in September by the opening of four academic-year programs, one each in French, Russian, and Spanish for teachers at the high school level, and one for

for elementary school teachers of French or Spanish. The year-long institutes have, of course, the distinct advantage of adequate time for the presentation of such a new and complicated subject as linguistics. They can more effectively illustrate teaching techniques and permit a thorough evaluation of "New Key" materials and methods by providing for the observation of demonstration classes throughout the year. They can offer an opportunity for practice teaching much superior to anything available in a brief summer program. The curriculum is thus richer and the pace less hectic and more conducive to true mastery of the material. All the advantages are not, however, on the side of the more sustained year-long program. In the academic-year institutes the participants, normally degree candidates, are much more definitely drawn into the life of the campus as a whole. They tend to lose their identity as a group apart, unlike the participants in summer institutes united by common interests and by their constant use of the foreign language in all the activities of the day. The very intensiveness of the academic program in a short-term institute gives to the whole summer's experience an; intensity which makes it something unique in educational life. But whatever the merits of the deeper, more sustained year-round program as opposed to the sharper impact of a summer institute, the fact remains that relatively few teachers will find themselves in a position to take advantage of it. It is sometimes difficult enough for a teacher to leave his family for two months in summer, but the problem of obtaining a year's leave of absence, of pulling up stakes from a regularly established home, and taking one's family for a year to a university center is, for most persons, insurmountable.

YEAR-LONG INSTITUTES, 1959-60

The academic-year institutes of 1959-60 were set up at Indiana University for 19 secondary school teachers of Russian, at the University of Massachusetts for 18 secondary school teachers of French, at the University of New Mexico for 20 secondary school teachers of Spanish, and at Western Reserve University for 25 teachers of French or Spanish at the level of the elementary school. The total cost was $550,523, or an average for each participant of $6,713.70. It must be borne in mind that this figure includes a stipend to compensate the participant, in part at least, for the year's salary he has had to give up in order to be free to attend the institute. Viewed in this light, the figure is really low.

SUMMER PROGRAMS, 1960

For the summer of 1960, contracts were made for the operation of 37 institutes. Though the numbers were much greater than the preceding summer, the problems were more easily met. In the first place, all institutes were announced during the winter so that applications could be called for by March 1. The experience gained by the directors of the experimental institutes of 1959 was made available to all directors of new institutes. They were brought together early in a conference which permitted a frank and full discussion of the program, of pitfalls to avoid, and of successful practices which might be followed. A coöperative plan for processing applications was established, and the problem of multiple acceptances was avoided. On the whole, before the institutes opened their doors to receive the participants, the faculty members were well informed about the objectives of the program and about the specific rôle each was to play in the closely coördinated academic curriculum of his institute. Observers who visited the institutes at the beginning of their operation in late June and early July were impressed by the smoothness with which they got under way.

SECOND-YEAR INSTITUTES

Three of the 37 institutes offered advance programs for teachers who had participated in one of the institutes of 1959. Of these, only the second-level French institute was held within the continental limits of the United States. It was organized on the campus of Hollins College near Roanoke, Virginia. The second-level Spanish institute, organized by the University of Puerto Rico, was held at Río Piedras adjoining San Juan, Puerto Rico, in that Spanish-speaking territory of the United States. The corresponding German institute, under the auspices of Stanford University, was set up at Bad Boll in Germany. These three institutes afforded an opportunity to selected graduates of the program of the preceding year to advance even farther toward complete fluency in their language, to gain an even deeper insight into the civilization of the country or countries where it is spoken, to develop added skill in the preparation of materials for teaching in the "New Key," and, by immersing themselves for a summer in the culture of their specialty, to acquire a richer background for effective teaching.

OTHER SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960

The remaining 34 institutes were distributed throughout the nation in 29 states. The New York and New England area was represented by Central Connecticut State College (French and Italian), Colgate University (French and Spanish), Dartmouth College (Russian), Hofstra College (German and Spanish), University of Maine (French and Spanish), University of New Hampshire (French and German), and Tufts University (French and Spanish). The mid-Atlantic coastal region had institutes at the University of Delaware (French and Spanish), at Temple University (French and Spanish), and at Virginia State College (French and Spanish).

In the South, there were institutes established at the University of Alabama, Converse College, the University of Georgia, Louisiana State University, and the University of Tennessee. All were in French and Spanish. The Southwest was represented by the University of Oklahoma in Spanish alone, and the University of Texas in German and Spanish. States other than New York bordering on the Great Lakes had seven institutes. These were located at the University of Cincinnati (French and German), Michigan State University (French and Spanish), Northwestern University (German and Russian), University of Notre Dame (French and Spanish), Rosary College (French and Spanish), and the University of Wisconsin (French and Spanish). Between the Great Lakes and the Rockies, programs were set up at the University of Kansas (German and Spanish), the University of Missouri (French and Spanish), the University of North Dakota (French and German), amd Washington University at St. Louis (French and German).

In the Mountain West, the University of Colorado had again in 1960, as it had had in 1959, a three-language institute for teachers of French, German, and Spanish. At Montana State University and at Utah State University, smaller operations took care of students in French and Spanish. On the Pacific Coast, there were three institutes. The University of California at Los Angeles, and the University of Oregon, served teachers of both French and Spanish. At the University of Washington programs were set up in French and German.

APPLICATIONS AND PARTICIPATION

The interest of language teachers in the program remained keen. Some 10,000 applied for admission, and out of these 2,013 were selected as participants. Again, of course, the great majority were public school teachers, but it is not without interest that 127 persons from private schools took advantage of the opportunity to improve their professional preparation even though for them there were no stipends or dependency allowances available. Secondary school teachers or supervisors numbered 1,742; their colleagues from the elementary schools totaled 271. The proportion of participants studying the three most commonly taught languages remained approximately the same as for 1959. French again led the list with 845, and Spanish was close behind with 777. German was in third place with 297 participants, while those in Russian numbered 66. For the first time a program in Italian was made available. This program was set up in the Northeast, for the major center for the teaching of Italian at the secondary school level is in the metropolitan New York area. Twenty-eight teachers of Italian were enrolled at the

Central Connecticut State College at New Britain.

The summer program of 1960 had, then, three times as many institutes as had been set up the previous year. They averaged fewer participants, for there were no new hundred-participant ventures established. In the interests of efficiency, smaller institutes with not more than two languages became the rule. The number of participants was 2.19 times as great as in 1959. The total cost reached $2,679,649, or an average per participant of $1331.17.

ACADEMIC-YEAR PROGRAM 1960-61

The academic-year program of 1960-61 is again a modest one, but it includes at least one highly interesting innovation. There are five programs in operation, two in French (Emory University and Pennsylvania State University), and one each in German (Kent State University), Russian (Indiana University), and Spanish (University of New Mexico). All these year-long programs provide advanced professional training for high school teachers; the institute of the University of New Mexico also accepts elementary school teachers of Spanish. The truly distinctive venture of 1960-61 is Indiana University's Russian Institute. This program was open only to native speakers of the language. Its purpose is thus not so much to teach the language as to train in modern methods of teaching a group of bilingual Americans. The mere fact that he possesses a language as a mother-tongue does not, of course, automatically prepare a person to teach it to English-speaking students in American schools. It would represent a great saving of time, and make available to American schools large numbers of potential foreign language teachers, if this experiment demonstrated that a year's intensive course concentrating on the major structural and phonetic differences between the two languages, and on teaching methods and materials, could equip an intelligent and educated native speaker of a tongue other than English as an effective foreign language teacher.

These five year-long institutes are training 117 teachers. The smallest group is in German, with 21 participants. Indiana's special Russian institute has 25 enrolled. In Spanish and in French there are 30 and 41 participants respectively. The total cost of these five programs will be $639,942, or $5,469.59 for each teacher enrolled.

GENERAL SUMMARY Thus between June, 1959 and June, 1961, a total of 49 summer institutes, running from six to eight weeks, and of nine academic-year institutes, have been established. Of the 3,132 foreign language teachers trained so far under the program, 361 have been drawn from the nation's elementary schools, and 2,771 from high schools. Teachers of French slightly outnumber teachers of Spanish, for the figures are 1291 and 1206 respectively. A total of 458 teachers of German have been enrolled, and 149 teachers of Russian. Only one institute offered work in Italian; there were enrolled in it a total of 28 teachers.

Such has been the scope of the program, measured in terms of the numbers of institutes and of participants, and even in terms of the sums expended. What is of greater interest and importance is the precise nature of the program of studies designed to improve the participant's command of the language he teaches; to acquaint him with some of the modern notions concerning the nature of language in general, and in particular the structure of the language of his specialty; to understand more fully the culture of which that language is one expression; and finally to train him in the teaching techniques that permit an effective use of newly-developed materials and an intelligent application to language instruction of electronic devices and other teaching aids.

Chapter III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF A LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

Of course the preparation of good teachers of science, or of English, or of art, or of any other academic subject, poses quite special problems. The requirements of a program designed to increase the competence of foreign language teachers are, however, unique. They include provisions affecting the entire physical environment of the institute as well as the organization of an appropriate program of instruction.

THE IDEAL OF A CULTURAL ISLAND

While it is desirable for reasons of morale to create a feeling of unity among the persons enrolled in any teachers' institute, the peculiar needs of a foreign language institute involve the creation of what may best be described as a "cultural island." If the participants are to make maximum progress in understanding and speaking the language, they must be placed in a situation which obliges them to use that language, not only in the classroom, but in all the multiple activities of the day from tooth-brushing time in the morning until tooth-brushing time at night. Housing arrangements must foster the fusion of the participants into a self-contained social group. If more than one language is represented in the program, the members of each group must be housed separately, and each must have its center for conversation, music, and informal entertainments.

MEALTIME ARRANGEMENTS One of the most natural occasions for language practice is offered at mealtime. A cafeteria serving food in the gulp-and-run tradition of many campus eating establishments cannot properly meet the needs of a language institute. The participants should have their own dining room, they should be grouped at small tables each presided over by a faculty member or other native speaker, and the atmosphere should be conducive to relaxed conversation.

HOUSING PROVISIONS Living a language and a culture, in order to absorb as fully as possible elements of both and thus make them a part of one's being, involves much more than does the study of a merely academic subject. Most institutes insisted that all participants, in order to benefit to the full from the experience of life in the cultural island, live in the language house. In some instances this requirement was extended to residents of the local community, though in other cases such persons were permitted to return to their homes after the evening exercises and to have breakfast with their family. At certain institutes of the summer of 1959, the presence of dependents interfered markedly with the exclusive use of the foreign language; in most instances the following summer participants were expressly told that families could not be accommodated.

HOLLINS COLLEGE--EXAMPLE OF A CULTURAL ISLAND

Clearly, it is possible to approach most closely the ideal of the cultural island in the case of a college which has no regular summer session and which can turn over virtually the entire facilities of the campus to the Institute. If only one language is presented, it is easier still to form a completely self-contained social group. This was the case in the summer of 1960 for the French Institute of Hollins College in Virginia. This was indeed a wholly French-speaking community. Even the signs identifying campus buildings were in French. The large West Dormitory provided ample room to house all participants and informants. In the gracious dining hall, the entire Institute personnel took their meals together, grouped about round tables admirably suited for conversation among the students and their teachers. The menu itself was printed in French. From the inter-faith church service Sunday morning through the social activities of Saturday evening, the participants heard and spoke nothing but French. In the rest period following lunch each day, a closed-circuit radio program brought to all members of the community in their dormitory rooms news of the Institute and of the world, all in French, and various features dealing with the language, culture, and music of France. Outside a French-speaking country, one could scarcely have achieved more effectively the ideal of total immersion in the language--and it might well be claimed that for the language teacher seeking to attain fluency approaching that of a native speaker there is no other road to salvation but the way of total immersion.

CONVERSE COLLEGE

Since it was the only second-year institute held within the continental United States, Hollins College is unique in the degree of fluency of its participants from the beginning of the program. It was more difficult for other colleges to create a community quite separate from the English-speaking world about them, but many succeeded admirably. Converse College at Spartanburg, South Carolina, can serve as one example out of many. The setting was in many ways comparable to that of Hollins--a charming small college, with no regular summer school in session. True, there was on the campus at the same time a National Science Foundation Institute, but the interests of the two groups were so unlike that the presence of one interfered little if any with the operations of the other. It must be admitted that English was heard along with French and Spanish in the lounge of the fine air-conditioned dormitory in which the language teachers were housed, for they shared this room with the science teachers, but the cultural unity of the French and of the Spanish sections of the language institute was quite effectively maintained. Mealtime arrangements were excellent. The Mary E. Gee dining hall of Converse College is a delightful room tastefully decorated in cool blue and white. Small tables encouraged conversation, and the presence of the senior staff members at meals and coffee breaks made of these occasions an informal but invaluable supplement to the language instruction given in class.

THE CULTURAL ISLAND ON A LARGE CAMPUS

Though the cultural island is most readily established on the small college campus, especially when only one foreign language is taught, in great universities where the institute was only one out of many summer programs in simultaneous operation this ideal was frequently approached. Louisiana State University is outstanding in this regard because of its two fine language houses--the Casa de las Américas, built around a charming patio where splashing fountains play, and the Maison française, with the gracious elegance of a château of the old régime. These fine residences are supplemented by the excellent facilities for dining in the paneled Faculty Club where the waiters serving the French participants are all native speakers of French, and those serving the Spanish participants native speakers of Spanish. These waiters, who also contribute to the program as informants, are chosen from among the many foreign students at Baton Rouge. It is, however, really unfair to single out specific universities in this regard, for almost all did much to assure good conditions for day-long use of the foreign language. The University of Alabama made available for its institute the newest and most attractive of its Greek houses; the University of Colorado drew on its long experience in operating a Language House during summer school; the University of Washington profited from a somewhat similar tradition. Purdue University might serve as an example of what could be done to create for the institute a cultural island in a large campus with no special provision under normal circumstances for separate language houses. This was done by arranging for the use of two buildings of the Men's Quadrangle. Spanish participants were housed in one, and French participants in the other. Each group had its own lounge and reading room, and its center for community singing and informal programs. A common dining room served both, though of course the participants were grouped by language at the tables. Several staff members lived with the participants and all regularly took their meals with them. The daily contact in the dormitory and at table with the Irish wit and rich wisdom of Professor Walter Starkie--noted Romance scholar, onetime associate of the Abbey Players, and renowned student of Gypsy lore--was doubtless more valuable for the Spanish students than any course they might have taken.

THE METROPOLITAN COLLEGE The cultural island can best be achieved in a one-language institute on a small college campus where no regular summer school is held. It can certainly be approached also, with ingenious planning, in a large university. There remains the situation of the college in a vast metropolitan center, a college normally serving students who live at home and travel by bus, subway, or commuter train to their classes. There have been institutes in such locations, and there may well be more, for frequently these colleges have superb resources in staff and equipment, and they can reach great numbers of foreign language teachers. That something valuable is lost when all participants do not live together in a self-contained community is undeniable. Great ingenuity in planning permitted San Francisco State College to operate a highly successful institute in the summer of 1959 with its participants housed in two downtown hotels. Hofstra College on Long Island, and Rosary College in the Chicago suburb of River Forest, ran good programs in the summer of 1960 with their participants residing likewise in hotels. As the program expands, some big city institutes may well draw a considerable proportion of their membership from their immediate metropolitan area. If they do not have all their participants housed on the campus itself, they will operate at a disadvantage, and their students will lose much that can be offered only by the more closely knit community of a college where participants and staff are in residence together. Indeed, the metropolitan university seems much better adapted to the presentation of an academic-year program than of a summer institute.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The physical environment of a foreign language institute is thus of great importance. It is not enough to offer a series of good courses and then show no concern for where or how the participant spends his time outside the classroom. The peculiar problems of housing and of mealtime arrangements for a successful language institute place a considerable burden upon the host college and upon the faculty, and involve more expense than would be necessary for setting up a training program in any other field of study.

PRIMACY OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

It would, however, be quite erroneous to give the impression that such physical arrangements take precedence in a foreign language institute over the academic program. It is precisely because they are an integral part of the academic program that they are so important.

DIFFERENCES IN FLUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS

One of the major objectives of the institutes is to give to participants a more accurate and more fluent command of the language they teach.

The problem of increasing their skill in comprehension and in speaking is complicated by the wide differences in background and experience on the part of American teachers of foreign languages. No matter what criteria for admission may be applied in an effort to assure homogeneity, there will still be considerable variation within any institute in the degree to which participants possess the basic language skills in comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing.

SUB-MINIMAL PREPARATION At the lower end of the scale are foreign language teachers who, for all practical purposes, have never heard the language they teach spoken by a native. Though a small minority, these are, unfortunately, still too numerous in American secondary education. They may be more common in certain relatively isolated areas of the country, but a few are to be found in virtually all regions. Often these are specialists in other fields who have been drafted to teach French or Spanish because years ago they had taken in college a couple of courses in the language. Most of these teachers with sub-minimal language preparation are conscientious, and fully aware of their deficiencies. They are now teaching a foreign language, and the school systems in which they serve will continue to use them for this purpose. It is important that they be assisted to improve their command of the subject.

NATIVE SPEAKERS At the upper end of the scale are native speakers of the language, or English-speaking Americans who are products of excellent college programs, perhaps supplemented by study abroad, and who have attained a near-native fluency and accuracy. It might at first glance appear that such persons, already possessing fluency, would need no further study in an institute. It is, however, from among these already well-qualified teachers that leaders for the profession can be drawn when they have acquired some insight into recent findings concerning the nature of language, some experience in the construction of effective teaching materials of various sorts, some practice in instruction with emphasis upon the early development of audio-lingual skills, and an acquaintance with electronic teaching aids and their operation.

BETWEEN THE EXTREMES Between these two extremes, there is to be found every degree of preparation in the language itself. Most institutes of 1959 and 1960 sought to serve the needs of the middle group, rejecting those whose competence would not permit them to enter more or less fully into the activities of the program, and those who were regarded as "over-prepared." An observer of the operation of the institutes could not help but note, however, that with very few exceptions both the extreme categories were represented among the participants of every institute. In the best-conceived programs, provision was made for adapting the study of the language itself to the needs of teachers differing widely in background and skill. Ideally, these provisions included diagnostic sessions to determine the weaknesses of each participant, and special corrective drills to fit his particular case.

LANGUAGE EXERCISES--PATTERN DRILLS

In addition to living in an environment in which the language was constantly heard and spoken, various courses and exercises were utilized to upgrade the participant in his command of language skills. One device quite generally used was that of the "pattern drill," a type of exercise developed in recent years by the linguists, and readily adaptable for use at all levels of instruction from beginning work with small children up to the most advanced studies of adults already fluent in a language, but whose speech patterns do not reveal precisely the turns of phrase or precisely the intonations of a native. The pattern of a structure in the target language is presented through examples, then assimilated by means of numerous drills obliging the student to utilize the structure in question by making substitutions or modifications in items presented to him for practice. The ideal is to drill, for example, on the formation of the negative, on interrogative word order, on the place and order of object pronouns, or on any of the patterns of the language, however simple or complex, until the student is prepared to offer an immediate and virtually automatic response. Where this sort of drill was utilized in class instruction, it was usually carried over also into the laboratory sessions where repetition until total assimilation could be assured.

THE LABORATORY--LISTENING PRACTICE

Laboratory installations of course varied widely from institute to institute, as did the use made of the equipment in training the participants. The most rudimentary laboratory is of the listening type. It permits the student to listen to recorded materials as often as necessary for complete comprehension; it gives him the opportunity to accustom his ear to various native voices of both sexes, of different ages, and representative of diverse geographical regions and social classes; it permits repetitive and imitative oral exercises, but does not allow the trainee or his teacher to judge critically the accuracy of his responses. The listening laboratory, in spite of obvious shortcomings in its failure to let the student hear his own pronunciation and compare it with the model, can be of great value in training the most important of all speech organs, the ear. Until a sound has been heard accurately, no progress can be made in reproducing it with precision. Language experience begins necessarily with hearing before speaking can be attempted. Few, if any, institute laboratories were exclusively of the listening type, yet listening exercises were frequently used in virtually all of them. One fairly common practice was to record certain lectures (the lecture in culture especially) and to make it available in the laboratory for repeated listenings by those participants who had failed to grasp all parts of it when it was delivered in class. Less experienced students might listen to the same lecture a number of times, while those with a broader background in the language might move on to new materials of a more challenging and rewarding sort, perhaps more difficult dialogues and conversations, or literary recordings which could bring an element of cultural enrichment into the program.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MISTAKES

Mere listening exercises, as has just been noted, may occupy an important place in the most refined laboratory program. For effective drill in improving speaking as well as listening skills, however, two additional elements are necessary--firstly, provision for the student to hear his own responses and to judge them critically, and, secondly, provision for a competent teacher to monitor the work of the participants and to offer corrections immediately when the student makes an error. The simplest way to achieve at least in part this objective is to make each student station audio-active. The student makes his responses into a microphone connected with an amplifier. His own voice, amplified, reaches him through his earphones as he speaks. We normally hear our own voice, not from the outside as we hear other sounds, but from within, by conduction through the bones of the head. The audio-active installation at least supplements that inner hearing by amplified sound signals brought to the outer ear as all other sounds reach us. If at the same time the laboratory supervisor has provision to listen in on the responses of each student in turn, and to communicate individually with him so as to offer corrections and advice without disturbing others, then one has the type of installation which has been in the language institutes the usual minimum setup.

PROVISION FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

A further step is desirable, and indeed indispensable for certain purposes. This is achieved when in addition to the facilities just described provision is made for the student to record the master materials and his responses, and then to listen critically to both. The usual device is to include a tape-recorder at each student station; sometimes, magnetic disc equipment is substituted for the tape machine; in rare instances more complicated remote-control devices are employed in which the actual recording is made, not at the student's booth in the laboratory, but at the control center directly under the supervision of the laboratory director. Examples of all these types of installation, and of variants of them, were to be found in the institutes.

TYPES OF LAB INSTALLATION

Naturally installations varied greatly from institute to institute. They ranged from a 12-booth laboratory, basically a listening laboratory only, though with some provision for one or two students at a time to use an audio-active booth or to record, at one of the smaller institutes of 1959, up to large and exceedingly flexible installations. As examples of these, one might note Colgate University with a 53-place laboratory with audio-active booths and a 34-place one complete with recording equipment at each station; Purdue University with two fully equipped 26-place laboratories, and for special purposes access to a 64-booth installation with four remote-controlled 16-channel recorders; the University of Washington with an 81-place listening laboratory served by a console which can furnish simultaneously 15 different programs, plus a smaller audio-active testing laboratory; or Louisiana State University with 72 fully equipped booths served by a 16-channel console, and an additional installation of 24 booths, most of which do not have recording facilities.

The laboratory, whether rudimentary or elaborate, has had an important part to play in improving the participants' command of the language they teach; this has been achieved through exercises based on and continuing the class sessions on structure and usage, through phonetic drills, and through the opportunity to listen, repeatedly if necessary, to a wide variety of recorded materials.

IMPORTANCE OF DIRECTED CONVERSATION

Directed conversation has been an important element in the program of each institute. "Conversation" sounds deceptively easy. One might think it would suffice to put a group of Americans in a room with a native speaker and tell them to converse in order to generate a pedagogically useful conversation. This is, of course, quite untrue. No area of instruction requires more careful planning or more skillful direction than does an effective course in conversation. Topics must be carefully selected to represent the most common spheres of social activity, and workable plans for building vocabulary pertaining to these topics must be evolved. Where there are multiple sections of the course, coördination between them, and the adaptation of exercises to the degree of fluency of the members of a particular section, pose serious problems.

ORGANIZATION OF CONVERSATION PROGRAM

Frequently native speakers with little or no pedagogical experience were utilized in conducting conversation classes. Results were sometimes poor in the relatively few instances in which these persons were left to their own devices to direct the class exercises. They were often excellent in the most carefully coördinated programs. Conversation, to be stimulating and useful, must deal with significant themes. One successful device utilized in certain Institutes to assure the selection of topics with some substance to them was to tie a part of the conversational exercises to the work in culture. Various procedures were employed to avoid the danger inherent in essentially oral work of making the intellectual content pretty thin; Institute participants are mature men and women, college graduates with a certain degree of general culture and some curiosity of mind, who would certainly become bored with day-long parroting. Purdue University in its conversation classes provided for significant subject-matter and for a variety in approach and in the personality of the instructor by having each section work for a time with each teacher. Since each teacher dealt with subjects pertaining to different areas of experience (the content of the culture lectures, readings of contemporary short stories, and dialogues previously prepared for the Fifth Army on situations encountered in travel), the rotation of instructors resulted in a wide variety of conversation topics, and the experience of conversing with a number of different persons.

USE OF NATIVE INFORMANTS

Louisiana State University offered the maximum opportunity for participants to engage in conversation daily with a native speaker. Each student had a one-hour session each day with an informant. This session might take place in a classroom not otherwise in use that hour, over a cup of coffee in the cafeteria, in a corner of the lounge of the Faculty Club, or under a live oak on the lawn. The nature of the individual lesson varied greatly with the background and needs of the participant. With those of relatively weak background, the informant might serve as a coach drilling on the lessons for the day; in the case of the most advanced students, the conversation might turn to any aspect of the social, intellectual, or political life of the informant's homeland. Each participant worked each week with a different informant. He thus had an opportunity to engage in direct conversation with numerous speakers, both men and women, of varied interests and representing a wide range of regional accents. Other institutes utilized the services of informants in imaginative and effective ways, but no other had a sufficient number to permit daily individual conferences for each participant with a native speaker.

THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE

The spoken language received special emphasis in the program of all the institutes, for, traditionally, in foreign language study American education has tended to neglect listening and speaking in favor of reading and writing. If, however, the need was greatest in the area of the audio-lingual skills, this does not mean that the written language was (or ought to have been) left out of the picture. Institutes varied greatly in the emphasis they placed on reading and writing, and in the devices they utilized to increase proficiency in those skills. In some programs, extensive readings were called for in connection with the study of culture. At least one institute had a reading clinic, a specific course designed to develop accuracy and ease in reading. Dictations were commonly given, and frequently compositions were assigned on subjects treated in the conversation classes or on topics drawn from the culture course. Other types of written exercises were employed in connection with the study of the language.

LANGUAGE ANALYSIS

The statement on qualifications for teachers of modern foreign languages prepared by the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America and endorsed by the MLA Executive Council, the Modern Language Committee of the Secondary Education Board, the Committee on the Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, and numerous other national or regional language associations, has furnished an indication of the areas of competence which ought to be a part of the preparation of the foreign language teacher. This widely accepted statement lists "language analysis" as one of the areas in which competency is to be expected, and further describes in these terms the attainment of the teacher of superior preparation: "ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics to the language-teaching situation."

APPLIED LINGUISTICS

As a consequence of this statement produced by the language teaching profession and endorsed by its regional and national organizations, it seemed obvious that the NDEA Institutes should give some attention to introducing the participants to the recent conclusions of linguistic science concerning the nature of language and to specific applications of linguistic principles to the effective teaching, at the elementary or high school level, of the language of each participant's specialty. Part II of the Manual distributed to colleges and universities as a guide in the preparation of a proposal for an institute contained the statement that "ample consideration should be given to classroom implications of applied linguistic principles."

PROBLEMS IN PRESENTING LINGUISTICS

Linguistics has not normally had a place in teacher-training programs. The subject was therefore unfamiliar to the participants. The problem of presenting in a brief summer program a subject entirely new for the students was further complicated by the fact that linguists in general lacked experience in addressing themselves to such a group and in dealing specifically with the application of linguistic principles to the teaching of foreign languages. The conflicting systems of symbols and of nomenclature employed by rival American schools of linguistics added to the difficulty of offering a brief but clear and practical introdcution to the subject.

VARIED REACTIONS TO LINGUISTICS COURSES

It is, then, understandable that the teaching of linguistics should have been the most debatable, and the most debated, element in the language institute program. On the one hand, no course aroused such enthusiasm on the part of certain participants in certain institutes. For these persons, the revelations of linguistics concerning the nature and function of language proved to be the light on the road to Damascus, the one truly illuminating experience in the whole course of their professional preparation. For others, on the contrary (and sometimes these were in the same institute), the work in linguistics offered only confusion and frustration; in the midst of a new vocabulary and a new set of symbols (which seemed less precise and less valuable than what they had previously become acquainted with in a study of phonetics) they found nothing which could be of service to them in their teaching.

In the summer of 1959, in the first experimental institutes, there were certainly examples of courses in linguistics which were lifted almost without modification from regular graduate school offerings for specialists in the field. These were far beyond the grasp of high school teachers of a foreign language, especially when their content was concentrated even further for presentation within the few brief weeks of a summer institute.

PROGRESS IN PRESENTATION OF LINGUISTICS

Marked progress was made in the linguistics portion of the program between the summers of 1959 and 1960. The limitations in background, and the special needs of the participants, were more generally understood. Under contract with the U. S. Office of Education, a comprehensive Manual on linguistics had been prepared. Unfortunately, the magnitude of this undertaking meant that the book was not distributed until the eve of the opening of classes, or even, in some institutes, until after classes had begun. Teachers of linguistics had therefore had no opportunity to plan their course in such a way as to make maximum use of the work.

LINGUISTICS MANUAL

For use in the language institutes, the Manual and Anthology of Applied Linguistics was prepared under the general editorship of Simon Belasco of the Pennsylvania State University. The editor wrote the general section, which acquaints the student with the vocabulary and basic principles of linguistics, and treats in considerable detail major phenomena of phonology and grammar. The nature and function of pattern drills are fully explained and amply illustrated. There follow sections devoted to French (by Albert Valdman), to German (by Samuel A. Brown), to Italian (by Robert A. Hall, Jr.), to Russian (by Michael Zarechnak), and to Spanish (by Ismael Silva-Fuenzalida). In each of these, the effort is made to offer a practical application of linguistic principles to the analysis and the teaching of the language in question, with contrasts between that language and English given a prominent place, and numerous examples of effective drills provided. Part II of the volume consists of a useful anthology of pertinent articles drawn from the major professional journals in the field of foreign languages. It is a substantial work of nearly 500 pages, 8 1/2 by 11 inches. It is reproduced by a photo-offset process. The nearly 300 pages of Part I are very closely typed in small characters, so that a surprisingly large amount of material is presented on a single page. In Part II, the typography varies, of course, with the review whose pages have been reproduced.

The major problem in the use of the Manual was clearly the fact that, for perfectly understandable reasons, it could not be distributed prior to the opening of the 1960 summer institutes. The material is of course not simple. Some teachers in the program, having already planned their course around other texts, made a quite limited use of this work. On the whole, however, it proved to be a valuable aid, and contributed to making the presentation of linguistics in the second summer much more vital and more practical. The text is currently undergoing a thorough revision; the 1961 edition will doubtless show a gain in clarity and in precision over the first edition, reflecting the experience of those who used the work in the 1960 Institutes. It marks certainly a major step toward making the findings of linguistic science accessible to teachers of modern foreign languages.

SHORTCOMINGS AND MERITS OF LINGUISTICS COURSES

One thing which militated against the total success of the linguistics courses in the Institutes of 1960 was the lack of American linguists who have devoted themselves expressly to the problems of teaching French, German, Spanish, or one of the other languages included in the program. Linguists in the United States have most often concentrated either on exotic languages or on the teaching of English to foreigners. Some institute courses dealt almost exclusively with the phenomena of American English. Now such a study can provide many valuable insights into the nature of language, but it does not specifically meet the needs of the participants. Most successful were those courses which presented a minimum of theory but concentrated on troublesome differences in structure, sound systems, and tonal patterns between English and the target language, and provided intensive practice in linguistically sound pattern drills and the opportunity to adapt or develop comparable exercises to fit the teaching situation in the participants' own classes. The experience of the two summers has amply demonstrated the potential contribution of linguistics to the preparation of foreign language teachers, and the need for increased experience on the part of linguists themselves, and for the development of new materials, before that potential can be fully realized.

METHODS AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Closely related in many respects to the study of linguistics was the work in methods and the demonstrations of new teaching techniques. In most cases, the presentation of methodology was closely tied to the demonstrations. Frequently, it included a briefing session in advance of the demonstration, in the course of which the attention of the participants was drawn to certain points to observe with special care. Almost without exception a critique followed the demonstration, at least certain days of the week. In the most successful courses in methods, the linguist and the demonstration teacher attended this session and took an active part in it.

GENERAL SUCCESS OF DEMONSTRATIONS

The Act itself specifies that institutes established under its provisions shall offer advanced training "particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials." The demonstration classes were of quite special importance in fulfilling this objective. The general conclusion of those who had the opportunity to observe closely the work of the institutes is that the demonstrations were superb. Effective methods of teaching foreign languages, with initial emphasis upon listening and speaking, were applied in realistic situations with classes of elementary or high school children. No finer proof of the workability of what have come to be called "New Key" methods could be sought than the rapid progress and accurate pronunciation of the children in these demonstration classes.

ORGANIZATION OF DEMONSTRATIONS

In some instances, as at the University of Alabama, the demonstration classes were an integral part of the instructional program of the local school system. More commonly, they were organized expressly for the institute and were independent of the school district. In most cases, the participants observed from the back of the classroom. Some schools (the University of Delaware, for example) had available special observation rooms separated from the demonstration class by one-way glass and equipped with loud speakers which brought to the observers the voices of the teacher and pupils. This provision allowed for a more natural classroom situation, since the children were not constantly aware of the presence of visitors observing them. This same end was met by other institutions (the University of Missouri and the University of California at Los Angeles, for example) through the use of closed-circuit television for observation purposes, though there is some evidence that in less-than-ideal situations the bright lights, the presence of cameramen moving about, and the restricting cord of the microphone worn by the teacher, may interfere with the effectiveness of the class.

NEW KEY TEACHING MATERIALS

Under contract with the Office of Education, there had been prepared for the high school demonstration classes in NDEA foreign language institutes "New Key" lessons in each of the commonly taught modern languages. Additional units were ready for the summer of 1960, and work continues on the testing and revision of these "Glastonbury Materials." The initial period of study of the language is entirely oral; only after a number of units have been mastered, and their content assimilated through many exercises and drills, is the transition made to the reading of these same materials. Always the approach is through the ear. No materials are presented in written form until the student can handle them readily and with something close to native accuracy in pronunciation and intonation. By that time the danger is slight that the pupil will be misled by spelling into a false pronunciation based on the value in English of letters and combinations of letters. The dialogues present situations which are natural and familiar ones for youngsters of the high school age group.

LABORATORY DRILLS IN NEW KEY MATERIALS

Tapes recorded by native speakers accompany these materials. In most instances, the experience of the demonstration class was augmented and deepened by further listening and speaking drills in the laboratory. The participants, observing and assisting, thus had the opportunity to learn how they might most effectively utilize a laboratory if their school, perhaps with the assistance of the federal government under the terms of Title III of the National Defense Education Act, should succeed in making one available for its modern language classes.

The use of the Glastonbury Materials was not, of course, mandatory. A few Institutes chose indeed to use other materials adaptable to audio-lingual teaching.

SUCCESS OF DEMONSTRATIONS

Almost without exception the demonstration teachers revealed unusual vivacity and a rare skill in arousing and holding the interest of the pupils. The participants carried away from the institutes a keen admiration for the "New Key" teaching they had observed, and a firm resolve to seek to achieve comparable results. There can be no doubt that, by and large, the domonstrations constitute the most successful element in the program. This is equally true of demonstration classes at the elementary school level. Here there was less uniformity in content, for there were no materials comparable to those made available for the high school level and utilized in almost all the Institutes. Doubtless even more depends upon personality in teaching a foreign language to small children; at this level, games, songs, and the use of realia are essential elements in instruction. Remarkable elementary school demonstrations were to be found in Institutes in all areas of the country.

PROBLEM OF PROVIDING TEACHING PRACTICE

Teachers accustomed to the traditional teaching of grammar and translation need, of course, practice in applying the "New Key" methods. How to provide that opportunity for experience in this new approach to language teaching is a very real problem. In some of the smallest institutes, it was possible to let every participant try his hand at conducting the class. While this may seem the logical and even the ideal answer to the problem, it really could not work satisfactorily where the number of participants was large. Visitors reported that the effectiveness of the demonstrations was greatly reduced in one otherwise excellent institute precisely because the effort was made to allow each of the numerous participants to take over the class briefly. The result was that student-teachers in rapid succession presented to the class some small fragment of the lesson. This constant changing of teachers was confusing to the children, and prevented the participants from observing the full development of a teaching unit presented over a period of several days by a master teacher.

PARTIAL SOLUTIONS TO PRACTICE TEACHING PROBLEM

Some effective partial solutions to the problem were evolved. In certain institutes the participants worked together in teams to prepare a unit for presentation to the class, but only one member of the team would be selected to do the actual teaching. In others, the practice teaching was done, not before the children of the demonstration class, but before the participants in the methods course; this is at best a highly artificial situation. In the summer of 1959, so many children sought admission to the elementary school Spanish demonstration class at Louisiana State University that the teacher was able to organize two separate classes. She conducted one entirely herself, thus giving the participants the opportunity to observe the uninterrupted application of "New Key" principles by a master teacher throughout the institute session. In this demonstration class there was no break in the continuous development of language skills according to a clearly conceived set of principles applied day by day by an expert in the teaching of Spanish to small children. Under her constant guidance and supervision, the participants were regularly given the opportunity to try their hand at this sort of teaching before the second class of grade school youngsters. This expedient of organizing two separate demonstration classes, of which one is conducted exclusively by the demonstration teacher, was adopted in a couple of institutes of 1960. It has, of course, certain inherent difficulties. Where the institute is located in a small community, it may not be feasible to organize two separate classes at the same level. It is not impossible, too, that parents whose children are assigned to the class utilized for practice teaching may feel that their children are receiving instruction somewhat inferior to that provided in the section conducted exclusively by the master teacher. There is, in short, no easy solution to the problem of providing adequate opportunities for practice teaching on the part of the participants. Ingenious attempts to solve it have been made, but it remains a problem to tax the ingenuity of directors and of demonstration teachers.

INTRODUCTION TO AN UNFAMILIAR LANGUAGE

Related to both the presentation of linguistics and that of methods is the use of an introduction to an unfamiliar language as a device to acquaint the participants with the reactions of a student beginning the study of a foreign tongue and with certain linguistic principles and pedagogical techniques. Putting the institute participant in the position of a beginner encountering a new language has, indeed, a certain shock value. The experience of those institutes which used this device experimentally would seem to indicate that a new language so presented should occupy only a small place in the overall program (the objective is not, after all, to impart a working command of the language), and that tests and grades on this material are doubtless unwise. It is of course essential, if the project is to be of any value, that the language be well taught in accordance with the principles set forth in the courses in linguistics and in methods. Basque was utilized in an introduction to linguistics in the University of Delaware Institute, and had a small place in the program of Utah State University. Participants at the University of Texas studied Japanese in lessons presented by closed-circuit television, and Russian was taught at the University of Maine to teachers of French, German, and Spanish. The unfamiliar language was not a general feature of the curriculum of NDEA institutes, but it was used in a number of instances and proved, when skillfully employed, a most useful device.

MEANING OF CULTURE

The remaining important area of study in the overall program is that of culture. Now the word "culture" can be defined in several markedly different ways. It is frequently used to designate the major contributions of a people to the arts, letters, philosophy, and the sciences. Most academic courses in civilization deal, indeed, with culture so defined. The anthropologist uses the term in a quite different sense. For him, culture is the ensemble of the established patterns of behavior within a society. Culture so conceived deals largely with such features as family life, education, politics, leisure activities, religion, and a wide range of institutions and customs. Mealtime practices, the dating habits of young men and young women, participation in sports either actively or as spectators, the rôle of the press in informing or influencing the public, the attitude of children toward their elders--all these and many other topics, some dealing with apparently trivial aspects of life, are properly elements of culture in this latter sense.

CULTURE COURSES IN THE INSTITUTES

Culture in both senses was represented in the programs of the language institutes. There were examples in the institutes of courses that dealt essentially with the history of civilization, and which effectively made use of slides of major works of architecture, sculpture, and painting, and recordings of the works of important composers. Readings of representative masterworks of literature were sometimes coördinated with such a presentation of the arts. A course of this type can be stimulating and informative; it can contribute greatly to enriching the background of a student in order to make of him a more inspiring teacher of a foreign language. Many institute directors and teachers of culture felt, however, that this concept of culture was probably already familiar to the participants through their undergraduate studies, and they tended to emphasize the patterns of life today in the country or countries under consideration. Language is, after all, one expression of a culture; to fully understand a language, and to use it as a native does, one must relate it to the customs and institutions of those who speak it. Culture in this sense has not had traditionally the place it deserves in programs designed to prepare teachers of foreign languages.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER COURSES

One major element in this effort to impart a fuller understanding of customs and attitudes was the lecture in the culture course. This frequently furnished material for subsequent discussion sessions and even written exercises, for in the most successful programs the study of culture was closely coördinated with language study. There were many outstanding courses in culture. Perhaps the French culture course at Michigan State University might be cited as one example of a well-conceived program. Each day's schedule began with a half-hour lecture in French on some aspect of life today in France. These lectures were in standard French, delivered at a normal speed. In advance of the lecture, an outline was furnished the participants. This outline contained technical and other unfamiliar words most likely to confuse the listeners. The participants were forbidden to take notes during the lecture so that they might concentrate on listening. The lecture was recorded, and those who had not fully understood it could listen to it as often as necessary until they had mastered it. After the lecture, the class split into small groups to discuss, as a conversation exercise, the material to which they had recently listened. Weekly composition assignments were drawn from it also, as well as examples utilized for pattern drills in the language classes. There was thus achieved a close coördination of the culture course with other courses in the program.

Clearly, there were other means available for absorbing elements of the foreign culture. The daily contact with native informants was a rich source of cultural insights, and of course the whole experience, previously discussed, of life in a cultural island contributed to this end.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM Such, then, was the academic program of the institutes, designed to increase the participants' command of the language, and their acquaintance with new materials and techniques, so that they might return to their schools "and gladly teach." The examples cited have been drawn from the summer institutes, for they have been far more numerous than the year-long ones. Certain features are also brought into sharper relief in the more concentrated programs of six to eight weeks. The isolation of the participants as a community apart cannot be continued to the same degree in an academic-year program in which inevitably there is greater contact with the multiple activities of a university campus. Certain problems of the summer institute are, however, much attenuated in the longer program. The demonstration classes will be regular ones, in a quite normal situation, and time readily permits granting to each participant the opportunity to do practice teaching. The major elements of the program in both instances remain those discussed above: instruction designed to increase the language teacher's command of the basic skills of comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing; the presentation of basic principles of linguistics; an observation of "New Key" techniques and a discussion of their principles and objectives; and finally the study of the culture of the people or peoples who speak the language in question, with special emphasis upon the institutions and customs of today.

Chapter IV

AN EVALUATION
OF THE PROGRAM

EACH INSTITUTE AN INDEPENDENT ENTITY

Established under the terms of a contract with the U. S. Office of Education, each institute is an independent entity. Under ideal conditions, it is largely independent of the regular colleges, schools, and other administrative subdivisions of the host institution, for it is created as a special program by a contract with the president of the college or university. Its policies and procedures are not dictated by Washington. Indeed, one of the outstanding features of the entire program is the rôle played by imagination and initiative on the part of directors and their staffs in working out solutions to local problems and in planning courses and activities to meet local needs. Institute programs differ markedly in detail and in accent one from the other. These differences will be accentuated rather than diminished in the future as an increasing proportion of the institutes will be established to meet the quite special needs of certain restricted categories of teachers. Already there is in existence an institute planned exclusively for native speakers of Russian; somewhat comparable programs in French will figure in the overall plan for institutes forthe summer of 1961, and even in less specialized institutes there will be henceforth a greater effort to select participants at one of four different levels of attainment in their use of the language. The creation of specialized institutes to serve the needs of such widely differing groups of participants necessitates a high degree of flexibility in the program as a whole, and serves as an invitation to directors to engage in imaginative creative planning.

A COORDINATED NATIONAL PROGRAM

However much they may differ from one another, it is nonetheless essential that the various institutes be integral parts in a coördinated national program. Of course there are the stated objectives of the Act which must be met, and in consequence there are certain common elements which will necessarily be represented in the curriculum of each institute. The training in the use of new teaching materials and methods is thus prescribed by Congress itself. The emphasis upon the spoken language is a quite natural corollary of this requirement, as is indeed the recognition that some attention to linguistic principles be given in order to present the rationale of recently developed techniques. The basic framework of the program is thus set nationally. The Language Institute Unit of the Office of Education has the responsibility for considering the relative advantages of the hundreds of proposals submitted to it, and of conducting contract negotiations with those colleges and universities which appear by geographical location, by their resources in equipment and faculty, and by the spirit of understanding and evidence of careful planning revealed in their proposal, to be good choices for operating an institute. To assure proper geographical distribution, an equitable representation of the various languages taught in elementary and in high schools, adequate provision for teachers of varying degrees of competence in each language and from various levels of public or private education, this is part, and a very heavy part indeed, of the responsibility of the Washington office.

CONFERENCES OF KEY PERSONNEL

To achieve coördination in the midst of variety (without coördination there could be only chaos) the Office of Education organizes meetings of directors and of key personnel in various areas of instruction for an exchange of ideas and a sharing of experience. The purpose of these meetings is not to impose a common pattern upon all institutes. It must be borne in mind that the language institutes represent something quite unique in American higher education, and that the entire teaching personnel involved in these pioneering ventures is facing situations never before encountered. It is certainly wise that those who have successfully conducted an experimental program of this sort should share with their colleagues who are about to assume a similar responsibility the lessons which experience has taught them, and should offer warnings of dangers and pitfalls to be avoided. It is one of the major strengths of a truly national program that the successes and weaknesses of an institute held one year in California can be valuable guides the following year in planning somewhat comparable sessions in Georgia or New Hampshire.

PRODUCTION OF NEW TEXTS AND MATERIALS

Even in those areas in which the Office of Education has deemed it necessary to contract for the preparation of teaching materials and texts, their use has not been imposed upon the institutes. Faced with a virtually total absence of materials adapted to high school teaching of a beginning course in a foreign language with a purely oral approach, the Office has contracted for the expansion, testing, and improvement of the basic lessons prepared by Miss Mary Thompson and her associates in the school system of Glastonbury, Connecticut. This task has been assigned to the Modern Language Materials Development Center of the Modern Language Association of America. Making these materials available on a nationwide scale when shortly they will be issued for general distribution by a commercial publishing house may well prove in the long run to be one of the most important of current contributions to a revitalizing of language teaching. Their use, however, has not been obligatory, and the example exists of institutes using other high school materials for their demonstration classes. Similarly, the manual in linguistics was commissioned to fill a pressing need, for very little indeed had been written for the express purpose of making the findings of linguistics accessible to high school teachers of foreign languages. Once again, there was no requirement that the institutes make use of this work, and as was pointed out in the preceding chapter some of the teachers of linguistics in the institutes of 1960 did not employ it for their course.

EVALUATIONS

Another obvious responsibility of the Office of Education is to evaluate the program as a whole and the contribution of the various participating colleges and universities. There are three major devices utilized in making the evaluation. In the first place, members of the staff of the Language Institute Unit visit as many institutes as possible. The instititues are numerous, the staff is small, and funds for travel are limited. It is therefore not feasible for representatives of the Washington office to visit in person every institute, but at least each staff member of the Unit does have the opportunity to spend a few days observing closely the operation of a couple of institutes so that he may better understand the practical problems involved. In the second place, each director is called upon to submit a full report on the program he has headed; a frank and detailed evaluation of the program by the director and his faculty is an important part of this report. Self-praise and self-defense may have a place in these evaluations, but they are noteworthy rather for the penetrating and perspicacious analysis of weaknesses which many of them contain. In the third place, the summer institutes of 1959 and 1960 were the objects of a thorough, impartial evaluation carried out by a team of observers composed of representatives of the language-teaching profession itself.

THE MIDDLEBURY SURVEYS

Chosen to direct the objective professional evaluations of 1959 and 1960 was Stephen A. Freeman, vice-president of Middlebury College and director of that institution's long-established and universally esteemed summer language schools. No one in America has had experience to equal his in supervising intensive summer programs in foreign languages, with special emphasis upon audio-lingual skills; no member of the profession is more admired by his colleagues for his knowledge, breadth of background, organizational skill, and unfailing tact. To visit the Institutes and observe their programs in operation, he selected each summer a team of foreign language teachers representative of various levels of instruction, of the different languages which figured in the program, and of the nation's major geographical zones. These visitors led for a few days the life of a participant in the schools assigned to them, attending courses with the students, dining with them, and sharing the activities of their rare hours of leisure. They also interviewed the director and his staff, seeking in every way to form as complete a picture as possible of the operation. They noted weaknesses in the program, but they were much more concerned with discovering what were the outstanding merits of each institute, so that the example might be useful in the preparation on a nationwide basis of an even stronger institute program for the following year. The members of the survey team were representatives, not of the Washington office, but of Dr. Freeman's committee, and their reports were made to him. On the basis of these reports, and of a full and free discussion around a conference table at the summer's close, Dr. Freeman prepared for the Office of Education his lengthy confidential report, and the brief summary which was made public through the leading professional journals and in the form of a pamphlet.

GATHERING INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAM

Ten persons constituted the evaluation team for 1959. They visited each institute in pairs. A first visit was made as early as feasible after the opening of the program to gather information on the general organization, the physical facilities, and the curriculum of the institute. This visit lasted two days. The second visit took place near the end of the summer. Since it involved an evaluation of the progress achieved, more time was allowed for it. For three days the visitors sought to gain as complete a picture as possible of the operation and to gauge its success. In 1960, with more than three times as many institutes to visit, the practice of sending the observers in pairs was abandoned. Except for the two outside the continental United States, which were visited only once, each institute was visited twice, both times for three days. There were thus two separate and independent reports made on each program. As a matter of policy, the second visitor had not seen the report of his colleague who had preceded him, and his reactions were thus free from any prejudice which a knowledge of the observations of the other visitor might have given him. The reports were conscientious and detailed, based on careful observation and on numerous interviews with both faculty and participants.

NATURE OF A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM

From the reports of the evaluation teams there emerge certain general conclusions concerning the common elements of the most successful programs. The first is that the curriculum must not consist of a series of semi-independent courses, but must be a closely coördinated whole.

Pre-session planning conferences, regular faculty meetings during the session, and constant coöperation between staff members (including regular visits to classes of colleagues) are essential. To offer a fairly extensive range of optional courses is no advantage; indeed, it tends to obscure the major goal of the program and to destroy the unity of focus which should exist. What is important is to provide, within a closely knit curriculum, opportunities for students of varying backgrounds to work at the highest level and at the maximum speed which their language skills permit. Sectioning on the basis of ability thus seems essential, unless the participants can be selected with such care that they constitute a much more homogeneous group than has been achieved in any institute thus far. Flexibility of plans, and the ability to adapt the program to the specific needs of the participants as its inadequacies are revealed, are likewise of prime importance. Within reasonable limits, size is not a major factor in success. What should be avoided is having groups so small that they lose all sense of existing as a self-contained social unit. This occurred in 1959 in a small, three-language institute in which two of the languages had only seven and eight participants respectively. In such a situation, there is little to encourage constant use of the language in informal ways and the awakening of an esprit de corps which stimulates mutual efforts toward progress in language skills. While recognizing the high degree of success of a number of programs involving two and three languages, the reports make clear the distinct advantages of a single-language institute. Again, without in any way detracting from the superb planning which has permitted a number of large universities to create highly effective cultural islands upon their campuses, attention is called to the fact that there are numerous small, independent colleges which might well prove excellent sites for an Institute. Other factors contributing to the success of an Institute (besides the unity of the curriculum, provisions for homogeneous sectioning, and the importance of the cultural island) will be examined as the presentation of the évaluation of the program continues.

THE DIRECTOR As might be expected, the reports make clear the importance of the rôle of the director. He must be a regular member of the faculty of the host institution; the need for careful preliminary planning, and for the closest coöperation with the administration in arranging details of housing, of dining arrangements, and of classroom and laboratory use, precludes the selection of a visiting director. Anyone may well become a good director if he is himself a successful teacher conversant with and sympathetic toward language teaching with a special emphasis upon the development of audio-lingual skills; if he enjoys the confidence of his administration and can plead his case with sufficient eloquence to get from the officers of his institution special concessions they have certainly never before granted to the person in charge of any academic program on the campus; if he is an administrator of proven ability who can inspire his associates to work together in close harmony and to devote themselves with zeal to an exacting program which will occupy every hour of their waking day; if he is capable of winning the confidence of students, encouraging them in moments of depression, and serving them with such devotion that they in turn will exert themselves to the very limits of their physical strength and mental and spiritual powers to win his approbation; if he is a miracle worker who, without losing his head, can find immediately a physician or apply a tourniquet in an emergency, can without a moment's hesitation diagnose and correct a failure in laboratory equipment or (and this is the greater miracle) can find at once an electronics expert and get him to stay with the job until it is finished; and if he combines with a rare maturity of judgment an unflagging youthfulness of spirit, with gentle, long-suffering patience a firmness of character that puts up with no sloppy, second-best performances, and with the highest intellectual and scholarly qualities a physical energy which permits him to engage with zest in a Saturday evening picnic or in the variety show and ball organized by the participants. The astounding thing is that the program has brought to light a surprising number of really good directors.

DURATION OF DUTIES

The director's duties begin long before his institute opens. They begin, indeed, before the formulation of the proposal. If the proposal wins favorable attention in Washington, there follow the contract negotiations and the drawing up of a detailed plan of operations. Not only must he plan the curriculum, but he must make all the arrangements for the physical facilities the institute will require, hire staff and direct them in the preparation of their special area of the program, publicize the venture and take the leading part in the screening of applicants for admission. Clearly these obligations require that he be freed of other duties during the semester which precedes the institute. Nor do his responsibilities end when the participants pack up their suitcases, magnetic recorders, and boxes of books, pamphlets, and recorded tapes to head for home. There are still evaluations to make, reports to write, and a prolonged correspondence which will probably never end if he has succeeded in establishing a good rapport with the trainees in his institute.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

The director needs throughout the whole planning period and during the folow-up activities excellent secretarial assistance. Indeed, if he is to be available to the participants for consultation, as he should be, and if he is to have time to visit classes and fulfill his function as coördinator, the usual office routine ought scarcely to require his attention at all. If the program of his institute involves more than one language, he should certainly have an associate or assistant director for each, specifically responsible for supervising class instruction. But while such administrative assistance from qualified faculty members can be exceedingly helpful, experienced directors agree that it is the aid of a first-class secretary which is completely indispensable.

THE STAFF

The selection of his staff is one of the major responsibilities of a director. It is essential that all the language teachers be native speakers, or that they have a near-native command of the language. They must have the necessary gifts of manner and temperament that make spirited and effective teachers of foreign languages. It is important that they be in sympathy with the objectives of the program, and prepared to devote themselves wholeheartedly to their fulfillment. The reports of Dr. Freeman's teams of observers are quite critical of the use of local staff members who lack the above qualifications, but who are employed because they are readily available, or because no spot has been open for them in the regular summer session programs. Only teachers of rather exceptional background and somewhat uncommon gifts of personality belong in the institutes. It is almost inconceivable that any institution could properly man its institute entirely with local faculty. In most cases, a large proportion of the staff will necessarily be visitors from other schools in the area, or even drawn from a considerable distance. An institute is not just another minor venture of a foreign language department which can be staffed with teachers left over from the regular summer session, or which can be assigned to a second-string team.

USE OF ELEMENTARY OR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

If it is feasible, it is desirable that one or more staff members be drawn from the ranks of elementary or secondary school teachers. Normally, demonstration teachers will of course be so selected. One successful institute found it exceedingly useful to have a high school teacher as a sort of administrative assistant. The participants felt such a person to be much closer to them than were the college teachers, talked more readily with her about the program, and offered through her criticisms and suggestions which otherwise might never have reached the ears of the director.

SALARY PROBLEMS

In some schools problems arose, particularly in 1959, concerning the compensation of staff members. The duties are more exacting than those of what is normally a full-time summer session teaching load. Not only are many services outside the classroom required of the instructor, but he has before the institute opens materials to prepare for a new sort of teaching, and he is involved after the session's close in a thorough evaluation of the program. Undoubtedly some instructors were underpaid as a consequence of the local institution's applying its conventional formula for determining compensation for summer teaching. Now that the nature of the program is more widely understood, it would appear that most institutions are willing to recognize that teaching in a seven-week institute merits compensation for no less than eight weeks and perhaps even somewhat more. Compensation for visiting faculty members is commonly computed as a certain fraction (depending on the duration of the institute) of the teacher's annual salary. It seems desirable that this practice be consistently followed to prevent runaway bidding by institute against institute to secure the services of key personnel.

INFORMANTS

The staff will normally include certain junior assistants paid a small salary or hired on an hourly basis. These are the native informants, who are in many instances students from abroad. Their contribution to the program can be exceedingly valuable. They may be used to encourage conversation at mealtimes and in other informal situations, and even on occasion in some institutes to conduct directed conversation classes. With careful direction and supervision (for they are not trained and experienced language teachers) they can render excellent service. They can help much to add freshness and naturalness to the informal use of the language outside the classroom, and can help greatly in bringing alive for the participants the culture of the land from which they have come to study in America.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES The institutes of 1959, most of which were necessarily organized in haste after plans for the regular summer session on the campus had been completed, had frequently to put up with classrooms, offices, and living accommodations that were not the most desirable. The situation was better in 1960, though there were still examples of inadequate facilities. Ideally, administrative and faculty offices, classrooms, laboratory, and a lounge should form a rather compact unit, with residences and dining hall at not too great a distance. Of course it is not always feasible to assure such a compact grouping of facilities. It is interesting to note how one institution, with a definitely limited budget, came pretty close to achieving this objective. At Virginia State College the director obtained the attic floor of a building for the purposes of his institute. The quarters are somewhat cramped, but all the academic activities of the institute are centered here. Insulating board on the sloping ceilings makes the space reasonably attractive and quite usable. He was able to have these quarters air-conditioned, otherwise the small rooms under the roof would have been unbearably hot. The dining room was on a lower floor of the same building. The college could not furnish air-conditioning for the dining room, so the director rented for the duration of the

Institute a window unit which sufficed to keep the dining area reasonably comfortable during the humid heat of summer. Here in an institution less favored than many in the way of buildings and equipment, the ingenuity of the director and the coöperative attitude of the administration permitted the creation of a modest but adequate center for an institute.

DINING FACILITIES

It is clear that a language institute has special requirements concerning housing and meals far more demanding than those of other academic programs. This point has already been made clear. The reports of the observers are critical of the few instances in which the dining arrangements were not conducive to the use of the language. Sometimes language tables were set up in a general student cafeteria, amidst such din that conversation was impossible. It was pointed out that long tables with only one staff member presiding are not at all favorable to mealtime conversation. The reports occasionally note with obvious disapproval the absence of senior staff members from the dining hall. Indeed, they suggest that taking meals regularly with the participants should be a part of the service normally expected of a teacher on an institute staff, and that the director should make this point clear during the hiring negotiations.

THE SCHEDULE

No one expects the work in a brief summer institute to be anything but intensive. Many participants have reported that never before had they been obliged to work so hard. This is probably as it should be, though certainly in a few programs so much was demanded of the participant that he reached a point of exhaustion which prevented effective learning. The conclusion of the visitors who evaluated the Institutes is that a six-weeks program, especially when nearly a week is taken up with preliminary and final testing, results in too concentrated a dose of language and related studies. They recommend a minimum duration of seven weeks. The daily schedule must avoid overcrowding. A mid-morning and a mid-afternoon break do not represent a futile waste of time. They are essential if attention is to be kept high throughout a long summer day. If the proper atmosphere can be provided, these breaks can offer useful opportunities for an informal and relaxed use of the language.

Evening activities involving motion pictures, special lectures, song fests, and other forms of entertainment which provide additional language practice, were regular features of most Institute programs. If the courses include heavy outside reading assignments, these could in combination with the required evening activities become an impossibly heavy burden. The visitors found examples of teachers who, failing to recognize the overall purpose of the institute and the total volume of work required of the participants, made unrealistic assignments to be completed outside of class. Clearly, outside preparation is essential, but it is possible for a zealous teacher of linguistics or of culture, for example, to forget the demands of other areas of the program and to make assignments which no one could reasonably complete in the crowded day of an institute with its multiple occupations. The reports of the survey teams carry a warning against this practice. They also warn against the practice, observed in one or two instances, of seeking to crowd the whole week's work into five days. If there is a marked tendency for an operation to shut down at the close of classes on Friday, with participants and faculty scattering for the week-end to beach resorts and to nearby cities, the effect of the cultural island is destroyed. Picnics and excursions can be valuable occasions for additional practice in conversation with fellow-students, informants, and faculty, but a wholesale scattering of institute members to the four points of the compass nullifies much of the progress made during the week.

CREDITS AND EXAMINATIONS The survey reports of both 1959 and 1960 deal at some length with the problem of credit. Clearly, the observers would prefer that the program be divorced from all considerations of credit, and that the goal of increasing the participant's competence in the language and his skill as a teacher be considered adequate reward for his summer's work. It is obvious, however, that so radical a departure from accepted academic practice is not feasible. Colleges are used to weighing all offerings in terms of credits. Many participants report that to qualify for salary increases, promotion, or the renewal of a teacher's certificate, it is essential that they earn during the summer a certain number of academic credits. It is equally obvious that the program of a language institute does not fit the usual pattern of graduate school courses leading toward an M.A. degree. Some institutions offered regular graduate credit only for those portions of the program which most closely paralleled conventional courses, thus putting a premium upon the work in linguistics or civilization, and reducing the apparent importance of the improvement of language skills and the study of methods. This led to a reversal of the values which ought to have prevailed within the program. Observers who visited certain institutes toward the close of the 1959 session found the participants had ceased attending the demonstration classes and were devoting most of their time and attention to preparing for the exams in courses which would bear graduate credit so that they might get acceptable grades in them.

BLOCK CREDIT AND GRADES

The exercises in language skills, at least those adapted to the needs of the relatively ill prepared participants, may well be at a quite elementary level. It is a type of work which a department of modern languages would not normally offer at the graduate level. In one sense, it might be considered as remedial work rather than as a part of an M.A. program, yet in the institute it is the most important single element in the program designed to upgrade the elementary or high school teacher in his command of the language so that he may be a more effective teacher. The problem of credit was certainly less acute in those institutes which treated the entire program as a unit and offered block credit for it without breaking it up into so many units of credit for each course. Indeed, it is desirable that the constituent elements not be considered as separate courses. The practice followed in many institutes of assigning a single grade for the totality of the program seems desirable. This grade is of course arrived at through a discussion of the participant's work by the entire faculty. There has been much debate as to whether grades should be based on the attainment of some sort of absolute standard of excellence, or should be based on progress. Given the variety of backgrounds of the participants, and the fact that an effort is made to group them homogeneously for certain types of work, it is inevitable that effort and progress should enter into the determination of the grade. Since the program is essentially one of teacher-training, some institutes sought a solution of the problem of credit through a coöperative agreement with the Department or College of Education. The credits were made applicable toward a degree in Education, or toward a minor in Education for the M.A. degree in the appropriate department of language and literature.

MULTIPLICITY OF TESTS The reports of the survey teams indicate rather strongly a feeling that there has been too much testing in the institutes and too great an importance given to tests. In 1959, the Office of Education provided tests which were utilized as a measure of accomplishment by being administered at the beginning and at the close of the session. Two institutes, treating the participants as regular applicants for admission to the Graduate School, even added to this battery of tests the Graduate Record Examination, and in some instances certain College Board exams were administered also. Most institutes had in addition their own testing program covering their own courses. The time devoted to tests was thus frequently excessive, and in the institutes in which the participants were under pressure to seek high scores in certain areas in order to qualify for graduate credit the emotional strain was severe and the general effect quite damaging to the program.

MLA TESTS

In 1960 the tests being developed by the MLA to measure proficiency in the major fields of competence of the foreign language teacher were administered at the opening and at the close of the sessions. There are seven tests, four in the field of language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and one each in the areas of linguistics, culture, and professional qualifications. The institutes provided a proving-ground for these tests at a preliminary stage of their development, and their use in this situation permitted assembling valuable data for evaluating and revising them. In this preliminary form, the tests were long, requiring a minimum of eight hours to administer. In practice, most institutes had to devote at least a day and a half to the giving of the tests. They have now been revised and refined by the Foreign Language Program Research Center of the Modern Language Association in a coöperative effort with the Educational Testing Service. In their final form the complete battery of tests lasts less than four hours, and it can be taken for granted that in this process which has cut their length in half they have gained in pertinence and clarity. Most of the criticisms directed against the tests as administered in the institutes of 1960 will probably not apply to them in their new form.

EMOTIONAL REACTION TO TESTS

Facing this lengthy battery of tests immediately upon arrival at the institute was for many of the participants a decided shock. This shock was often salutary in that it opened their eyes to what they had still to learn in a field in which they were already experienced teachers. In other cases, even though the participants had been carefully prepared psychologically for the experience and had been warned not to take it too seriously, the reaction was disturbingly violent. One director, whose program had definitely been planned to assist a group of teachers with quite inadequate backgrounds, reports that several of his participants during the listening or speaking tests became so frustrated that they burst into tears and could not continue. They were allowed to complete the test with another section at a later hour. It is understandably rather painful for a teacher of French, when he has for the first time the opportunity to hear a native speaker of the language, to discover that he does not understand a word. The experience of listening to a recorded voice through headphones, and of seeking to make responses into a microphone, is for many novices a frightening one.

It is of course indispensable that there be effective standardized tests to measure the skills that the profession has recognized to be essential for the language teacher. It is fortunate that the Institute program brought together groups of foreign language teachers for whom these tests in an experimental form could be utilized as a measure of progress, and who could, by the mere fact of taking them, contribute to an estimate of their validity and to the establishment of norms. The observers were in no sense critical of the purpose or even the nature of the tests. They merely found the time devoted to them excessive, they criticized certain items of the culture test which seemed to suggest excessive emphasis upon the minutiae of a handbook on civilization, and they queried the value of using the linguistics test as a pre-session device for evaluating the participants' background when it was obvious that they had had virtually no opportunity prior to attending the institute to get acquainted with this field of study.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The basic criteria for admission to the institutes have previously been discussed. What is of special interest to note here is that his record, even supported by transcripts and letters of recommendation, is of little value in judging an applicant's ability to understand and to speak the language of his specialty. The courses he has taken in college do not reveal anything about the opportunities he has had to hear and use it actively. Any devices utilized to verify these skills are cumbersome. Clearly, none can equal in effectiveness a personal interview, but in the case of most institutes and of most applicants this must remain an unattainable ideal. Some directors have asked for a three-minute tape recording from their prospective participants so that at least the quality of their pronunciation in careful reading may be judged. Others have tried to use telephone interviews. Both devices create unnatural situations which render difficult a completely accurate judgment. It remains important to use every available means to gauge an applicant's degree of skill in handling the language. Paper records are inadequate, and the student's own estimate of his abilities is rarely accurate. Sometimes he overrates himself; perhaps less frequently he underestimates his competence.

THE TEACHER OF SUPERIOR PREPARATION

The observers of the program have shown a deep concern for the teacher of markedly superior ability for whom there was only a restricted place in the institutes of 1959 and 1960. They recommend the creation of special institutes for these teachers heretofore regarded as "over-prepared," asserting that from among this group with native or near-native fluency in the language, and with superior experience, it should be possible to draw many future leaders of the profession. The curriculum would, of course, have to be designed to meet their special needs. The major emphasis on language skills, essential in other institutes, would here be out of place. More time could be devoted to linguistics, and to the rationale of "New Key" methods. Instruction in methods so far has stressed how to get under way in the beginners' course using the audio-lingual approach. The problems of third- and fourth-year courses, and of advanced placement classes for superior students, have scarcely yet been touched. Perhaps in addition to studies specifically designed to prepare them for supervisory work, the teaching of these more advanced high school courses could be a part of the curriculum in a program designed for teachers of highly developed language skills and demonstrated superior teaching ability. It is most encouraging to know that the Office of Education has paid heed to this suggestion. As has been noted, experimental programs for native speakers will have a place in the 1961 institutes. In addition, institutes for high school teachers and supervisors are specifically designated in the general annourcement of the program as being designed for participants at one of four levels of language competence. It can be expected that programs planned for the most highly skilled will doubtless meet at least in part the need emphasized by the survey team.

FLES

In the summer of 1959, there were no Institutes designed exclusively for foreign language teachers at the elementary school level. Those institutes which provided work in methods and demonstration classes at the FLES level, grouped both elementary and secondary school teachers in the same courses of language, linguistics, and culture. The observers' reports point out that this is not in reality a very satisfactory way to handle instruction for these two categories of language teachers. In general, detailed courses in lingusitics are not essential or even meaningful for the elementary school teacher; a very few lectures explaining new developments in language teaching might very well take care of his needs. In the area of culture, what is of special interest to him is represented by simple elements of folklore, games, and songs. In many instances, the FLES teacher has had less training in the language itself than the average high school teacher, and needs to return to basic drills in pronunciation founded on the simplest of language patterns. For the same reasons, the tests which are being evolved to measure the competence of high school teachers are not ideal for their colleagues of the elementary schools. There is one decided advantage perceptible in having teachers at the two levels grouped in the same Institute; this is the possibility of having the participants observe, perhaps once a week, the demonstration class at the level other than their own. It is certainly wise that each group should better understand the special problems of the other. Effective coördination between language programs at the elementary and high school levels must repose upon mutual understanding. In spite of this consideration which favors the combined institute, the reports recommend the establishment of more institutes designed expressly for elementary school teachers. The first of this type was the academic-year institute of 1959-60 at Western Reserve University, while exclusively FLES summer institutes were set up for the summer of 1960 at the University of Kansas and at Tufts University.

SECOND-YEAR INSTITUTES

In the summer of 1960, second-year institutes were held in French, German, and Spanish for selected participants of the institutes of the preceding year. There will be institutes at the same level in 1961 in the same three languages, and also in Russian. All will be held, at least in part, in areas of the world where the language in question is spoken and where the culture of which it is a part can be observed. The second-year French institute will meet at Tours in France, the German institute at Bad Boll near Stuttgart in West Germany, and the Spanish institute at the University of Puerto Rico. In the case of Russian, a preliminary session will be held on the campus of the University of Indiana before the group moves to the USSR. It might be noted that travel for attendance at these institutes is not at government expense. The participant pays the travel costs out of his stipend. In these programs, the whole environment in which the institute is set becomes as it were a vast laboratory--not only a language laboratory, but also a culture laboratory--for the participants. The opportunities for progress in language skills, for a deeper understanding of the people and their culture, and for the gathering of materials to stimulate interest in language learning and to add enrichment to one's teaching, are obviously almost unlimited.

LIMITED PROGRAM AT SECOND-YEAR LEVEL

While recognizing the unique contribution of such second-year institutes, the survey reports do not recommend any great expansion of this portion of the institute program. They indicate that the major aim of the program should doubtless be to give at least an initiation into new methods and the use of new materials to as many foreign language teachers as possible. There are still 22,000 language teachers who as yet have had no opportunity to improve their language skills and to acquaint themselves with "New Key" techniques through study in an institute. The observers recommend that the major effort continue to be directed toward providing the stimulus and inspiration of a summer's intensive work to large numbers of teachers rather than toward producing a restricted group of highly skilled specialists by several successive summers of study in NDEA institutes. Indeed, they suggest that once the teacher has been shown the way toward a more complete command of the language and more effective teaching through participation in one of these summer or year-long programs at government expense, he might then reasonably be expected to contribute financially toward his further self-improvement and professional advancement. It is indicated in the reports that at this point government scholarships to assist a teacher to build upon the foundation received in an institute through further study planned to fit his own special needs, whether in the United States or in approved institutions abroad, might be a highly effective means of encouraging continued progress toward the soundest possible foreign language teaching in our nation's schools.

DEVELOPING LANGUAGE SKILLS The paramount importance of the upgrading of the participants in their command of the spoken language has been made amply clear in the analysis of the program. In reporting the evaluation of the institutes by the survey teams, it is unnecessary to stress again this point. In general, the reports reflect a most favorable reaction to language instruction in the institute program. In isolated instances, teachers were found using traditional grammar-translation procedures, but these cases were noteworthy by their rarity. Some institutes clearly had difficulty providing exercise material adapted to the needs of the participants with the weakest backgrounds. Criticism was made also of a few poorly organized conversation courses in which informants or instructors floundered about with no clear sense of direction and no knowledge of the skills and devices which can draw the students into meaningful discussions planned to build vocabulary and develop ease in self-expression and in comprehension. The most frequently encountered criticism of opportunities for developing language skills was addressed less to the actual courses in that area than to the overall provision for total immersion in the language. Some of the instruction in most institutes will necessarily be presented in English. It is unrealistic to present the elements of linguistics, and perhaps even the entire discussion of methods, in the foreign language, unless the institute serves exclusively students of an unusually high degree of fluency. To describe the operation of laboratory equipment in the foreign tongue is, in most instances, a patent absurdity. That some teaching will be done in English is recognized, then, as reasonable and desirable, but when lectures in culture are given in English also, and perhaps half or more of the student's day in class is devoted to listening to his own language, the program is out of balance and its principal objective is not being achieved. Obviously, too, the provisions for the use of the language outside the classroom enter into the ideal of total immersion in the language and culture.

THE LABORATORY Some institutes have done a superb job in diagnosing the weaknesses of their participants and assisting in correcting them. Others could do still more in this direction. This is one of the ends that the laboratory program should seek to serve. The laboratory has four distinct uses within an institute program. These functions have not always been recognized and provided for; in some programs one or more has been slighted. In addition to contributing to the development of the participants' language skills by means of listening exercises, pronunciation drills, self-criticism through comparison of his own recorded responses with the master materials, and remedial work designed for his special needs, the laboratory should be used also to acquaint participants with the operation of equipment and the techniques of good laboratory programs, to prepare original recordings or duplicates of exercises which they might effectively use in their own teaching, and to permit observation of the use of the laboratory by the demonstration class as an integral part of the work in methods. Perhaps the least effective part of the laboratory program has been in presenting realistically just how a laboratory can be used to best advantage in secondary school instruction.

LINGUISTICS In the presentation of linguistics, much progress was made in the institutes of 1960 over those of the preceding year. It has already been made amply clear, however, that this area of the program, while occasionally providing the most illuminating inspiration, has also evoked the most bitter complaints. It is to be hoped that the steps already taken in numerous institutes toward simplifying the presentation of basic principles, and stressing the application of linguistic theory to the actual teaching of the specific language in question, will be advanced even farther this coming summer. The observers feel that a detailed analysis of American English, whatever its value in offering an insight into the nature of language, is of little pertinence in terms of the overall objectives of the institute program. Examples of successful programs in the subject are now available. These can help future institutes avoid the error of giving too much stress to the theory of linguistics, without adequate application to the needs of the high school teacher. The revision of the _Manual_ will doubtless contribute toward this end, and will render unnecessary the purchase of several expensive textbooks of which only a very limited use could be made. This situation was found in two or three institutes, and led to complaints by the participants.

METHODS AND DEMONSTRATIONS In the experimental programs of 1959, there were examples of courses in methods which bulked large in the curriculum, which were essentially theoretical in nature, and which bore little or no relationship to the demonstration classes. These courses did not reappear in 1960. The observers are pleased to note that in most instances the presentation of methods the second summer was closely tied to the demonstrations. They report that with few exceptions the demonstrations were superb--vital and inspiring examples of "New Key" teaching. The problem of providing realistic opportunities for practice teaching remains, as previously indicated, a perplexing one. The survey reports offer no easy solution to it. Each director and each teacher of methods will have to exercise all his ingenuity to meet it.

UNFAMILIAR LANGUAGE The observers note with interest the use of introductory "New Key" lessons in an unfamiliar language as a means of putting the participants into the situation of a beginner in a foreign language course, and of permitting him to experience at the same time the frustration and the sense of triumph that may result as one faces the unfamiliar and then begins to grasp and master it. They report that this device in a couple of instances has been highly successful. They insist upon a vital presentation in accord with the best teaching principles if it is to have any value, and they warn against giving it any large place in the program. It's principal value is probably one of shock when an experienced teacher finds himself in the position of the pupil. It is suggested that, if this device is used, not more than two hours a week be devoted to it, and that progress in the unfamiliar language not be considered a factor in determining the participant's grade.

CULTURE PROGRAM

A successful culture program has already been described. The survey reports stress that such a course, not overlooking the great achievements of a people in the arts, philosophy, science, and literature, but emphasizing even more the familiar patterns of contemporary daily life, is the ideal to strive for. To be fully effective, it ought to be closely coördinated with the teaching of the language itself, as in the example of Michigan State University cited in the preceding chapter. The reports recognize the place of music in culture, but they warn against devoting any great proportion of class time to listtening to recordings, an experience in which little active use of the language is involved. A warning is made also against excessive emphasis on what is merely picturesque. The observers feel that the conventional college course of lectures on literature or on the history of civilization is not what can best serve the high school teachers in an institute. What is most important for them is to view the language as one element of a living culture reflected also in the institutions and familiar customs of the people or peoples who speak it.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE SURVEY

In what precedes, the critical judgments of the survey teams have been presented quite fully and frankly. To conclude from a few criticisms of specific detail that they have found the program unsuccessful would be completely erroneous. Indeed, they hail the summer program of 1960, in contrast to the "bold experiment" of 1959, as "a dynamic and positive achievement." The evaluations made under the Office of Education's contracts with Middlebury College are realistic in measuring shortcomings, many of which were already corrected in the second summer of operation, but they are warmly enthusiastic about the positive accomplishments of the program. They see it as inspiring in the participants a forward-looking attitude toward language teaching, and a real missionary zeal for sharing with colleagues the new techniques and viewpoints which the institutes have permitted them to acquire. They view the impact of the program upon language teaching in American schools as truly tremendous, and see already in effect as a consequence of it a revitalization of instruction in this critical area. The reports leave no doubt that the observers view the NDEA institute program as the most significant move ever made to improve the quality of language instruction in our country,and as one highly effective means of striving to meet the nation's critical need for countless citizens trained in languages other than their mother tongue.

EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

It is fascinating to go through a voluminous file of comments by participants on the experience of attending an NDEA language institute. In dozens of letters one encounters the notion of an experience so richly rewarding both personally and professionally that it can scarcely be described except in the terms of a mystic revelation. The bitter comments of malcontents are exceedingly rare--just enough, not one out of a hundred, to demonstrate that we are at least dealing with human beings. It is an almost unanimous chorus of gratitude for the acquisition of a new insight into language teaching, and of improved skills for achieving in the classroom a much higher degree of success. Space does not permit the inclusion of an anthology of comments by participants, but it is of interest to note a few typical examples of what, from all corners of the country, eager teachers of foreign languages have written about the program in which they had participated.

EFFORT AND REWARD

All agree they had put forth great effort, but that it was rewarding. One writes: "I have never worked so hard at anything in my life as I worked this past summer at the institute, but never have I had such a feeling that all the effort was worthwhile. My whole approach to teaching Spanish has changed as a result, and I think I am doing a much better job." Another, speaking of benefits derived from participation in an institute, declares that "it was a memorable and inspirational experience. The direct result of this experience is that I am now a more effective, as well as an inspired language teacher, as evidenced by the results I am obtaining with my students." Still another writes: "I feel the good I derived from the institute is immeasurable. It's a glorious feeling to go into a class and know you're being successful. The only drawback is the burning thirst for more--not more success, but more opportunities to improve even more."

THE CONVERT'S ZEAL

The experience of conversion, and the rich satisfaction derived from a more complete mastery of skills and a greater success in teaching, are described or suggested in letter after letter. "It is rather difficult in so little space," writes one teacher, "to explain how beneficial I believe the institutes are. I do feel that nothing in my past training has contributed to improve my teaching as have the past two summers in institutes." Another says in part, "It has definitely helped me to teach better and has opened wider vistas in my teaching. The progress made by the elementary children under the oral-aural method is amazing." The experience is summed up by one participant in the words "unique, stimulating, and challenging . . . also fun. It was unique because I had never lived in a dormitory before . . . ; stimulating because I had been away from speaking German for 18 years and found myself suddenly regaining command of a language which had lain dormant in the recesses of my mind for these many years; and challenging because the staff presented new methods, new materials, and new angles for teaching German."

WIDESPREAD INFLUENCE Over and over again one encounters the idea that the missionary zeal of the participants is being transmitted to others and spreading the impact of the program on American education. One teacher declares, "I feel that I am really teaching a 'living' language. My whole outlook has changed, and I also find myself wanting to let other teachers of the language in on this discovery." Members of religious orders, though for them there are no subsidies in the form of stipends and dependency allowances, have been among the most eager beneficiaries of institute training. One such participant writes: "I found the institute very beneficial and have encouraged our Regent of Studies (Carmelite Province of the Most Pure Heart of Mary) to send more language teachers to future institutes." The effect one convert can have upon a whole school system is suggested by the following statement: "Since I was the oldest teacher who attended the 1959 Institute, I probably had the most to learn about the new methods. I was completely converted, and have totally revised my methods. The results have been favorable and astonishing. Since I was head of the language department in my school, I started a complete revision of the modern language curriculum, an action which led to the installation of a complete language lab last spring . . . . We have expanded our language offerings to third and fourth years in the senior high and to ninth grade in the junior high. We plan to include all the grades as fast as we can get trained teachers." It could be noted in passing that the director of the Institute in which the writer of that note took part is justly proud of his perspicacity in sensing that here was a teacher of 60 years of age who was an exceptionally desirable prospect as a participant.

Still another letter reflects the way in which the effect of the institute program can expand as those who have had contact with it influence others about them. "It would be difficult to assess the overall benefit to the teaching of foreign languages resulting from the institute program without keeping in mind that each participant returns to his post in possession of techniques and a philosophy which will slowly be transmitted to one's colleagues, administrators, student teachers, and perhaps even school board members."

THE JUDGMENT OF CONGRESS

So far three evaluations of the program have been considered, that of the directors themselves, that of the professional survey teams, and that of the participants. All have been highly favorable. A third extremely eloquent judgment has been made by the U. S. Congress. The sum of $5,200,000 had been requested for the Institute program for 1961. The Congress appropriated for this purpose $7,250,000. There is scarcely a more effective way of expressing confidence in a program, and the sincere desire to see it developed even further. All who have been in a position to judge the value of the language institutes have been enthusiastic in recognizing their success, and their great contribution toward revitalizing language teaching in this country.

A CONTINUING INFLUENCE

Even if the program were brought to an abrupt end at the close of only two years of operation, its influence would continue to be felt for a long time. Over and over again participants in their letters tell of teachers' workshops in which they have taken part, of talks they have delivered, of demonstrations they have directed. Numerous persons trained in institutes are in positions of influence in the teaching of foreign languages. Frequently the experience of attending an institute has been a major factor in promotion to a post with supervisory responsibilities. In city, county, and state educational positions there are now key persons with institute training. This is true of many of the foreign language specialists working with state departments of public instruction in connection with the activities under Title III of the National Defense Education Act. The influence of the institutes is thus widespread.

THE ROAD AHEAD

No, the institutes would not lose their influence were the current ones to be the last. Fortunately, however, there will be others still to come. However great the impact on the profession, only 3,000 teachers have so far had direct contact with the program. This is just a start--a significant start, but it still leaves the great majority of foreign language teachers untouched. The nation's need for persons trained in languages is increasing. Programs in our schools are expanding, and should expand much more until opportunities for language study exist in an unbroken sequence from the early grades through high school. A greatly increased corps of language teachers is essential to realize this goal. A continuation and expansion of the successful language institute program now operating under the terms of the National Defense Education Act could be the major influence in preparing the teachers necessary to correct our nation's shocking and disastrous ignorance of languages other than our own.

TABLE I.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1959

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Colgate Univ. Hamilton, N.Y.	Charles A. Choquette	6 wks. June 29-Aug. 7	French German Spanish	Sec. Sec. Sec.	70	69	1	$ 77,665
Univ. of Colorado Boulder, Colo.	George A. C. Scherer	8 wks. June 22-Aug. 14	French German Spanish	Sec. Sec. Sec.	99	88	11	$116,938
Univ. of Georgia Athens, Ga.	Howard S. Jordan	6 wks. June 15-July 22	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	61	60	1	$ 77,079
Hollins College Hollins, Va.	Maurice W. Sullivan	8 wks. June 22-Aug. 16	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	69	69	0	$ 85,956
Louisiana State U. Baton Rouge, La.	John A. Thompson	8 wks. June 14-Aug. 8	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	80	73	7	$ 87,042
Univ. of Maine Orono, Me.	Wilmarth H. Starr	7 wks. July 6-Aug. 21	French German Spanish	Elem. and Sec. Sec. Sec.	99	91	8	$100,690
Univ. of Michigan Ann Arbor, Mich.	Otto G. Graf	8 wks. June 22-Aug. 14	French German Spanish Russian	Elem. and Sec. Sec.	100	93	7	$107,637
Univ. of Missouri Columbia, Mo.	John S. Brushwood	6 wks. June 22-July 31	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	66	65	1	$ 56,058

TABLE I.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1959 (CONCLUDED)

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
San Francisco State Coll., San Francisco, Calif.	Joseph Axelrod	8 wks. June 20-Aug. 21	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	68	62	6	$ 74,699
Univ. of South Dakota Vermillion, S.D.	Leonard Arnaud	7 wks. June 15-July 31	French German Spanish	Sec. Sec. Sec.	33	33	0	$ 45,552
Univ. of Texas Austin, Tex.	Theodore Andersson	8 wks. June 22-Aug. 14	French German Russian Spanish	Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec.	78	75	3	$ 95,310
Univ. of Washington Seattle, Wn.	Howard L. Nostrand	8 wks. June 29-Aug. 21	French German Russian Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	97	94	3	$118,873

TABLE 11.--ACADEMIC YEAR INSTITUTES, 1959-60

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Parti-cipants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Indiana Univ. Bloomington, Ind.	William B. Edgerton	36 wks. Sept. 17 1959 - May 25 1960	Russian	Sec.	19	19	0	$115,180
Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.	Robert B. Johnson	38 wks. Sept. 14 1959 - June 5 1960	French	Sec.	18	17	1	$106,000
Univ. of New Mexico Albuquerque, N.M.	R. M. Duncan	37 wks. Sept. 18 1959 - June 4 1960	Spanish	Sec.	20	19	1	$122,095
Western Reserve Univ. Cleveland, Ohio	Ruth Mulhauser	38 wks. Sept. 21 1959 - June 11 1960	French Spanish	Elem. Elem.	25	25	0	$207,248

TABLE III.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Univ. of Alabama University, Ala.	Wade H. Coleman	8 wks. June 13-Aug. 5	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	40	40	0	$ 67,248
Univ. of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles, Calif.	John E. Englekirk	7 wks. June 27-Aug. 12	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	60	56	4	$ 75,800
Central Connecticut State College New Britain, Conn.	Arthur M. Selvi	6 wks. June 27-Aug. 5	French Italian	Sec. Sec.	58	54	4	$ 63,295
Univ. of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio	L. Clark Keating	6 wks. June 27-Aug. 5	French German	Sec. Sec.	54	52	2	$ 69,795
Colgate University Hamilton, N.Y.	James F. Dickinson	7 wks. June 26-Aug. 13	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	60	59	1	$ 83,731
Univ. of Colorado Boulder, Colo.	George A. C. Scherer	8 wks. June 26-Aug. 20	French German Spanish	Sec. Sec. Sec.	104	90	14	$133,435
Converse College Spartanburg, S. C.	Sanford Newell	8 wks. June 13-Aug. 6	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	39	39	0	$ 57,175
Dartmouth College Hanover, N. H.	Basil Milovsoroff	7 wks. July 1-Aug. 18	Russian	Sec.	40	37	3	$ 49,498

TABLE III.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960 (CONTINUED)

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Parti- cipants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Univ. of Delaware Newark, Del.	Max S. Kirch	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	59	56	3	$ 81,104
Univ. of Georgia Athens, Ga.	Howard S. Jordan	7 wks. June 13- July 30	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	60	60	0	$ 81,421
Hofstra College Hempstead, N.Y.	Joseph G. Astman	8 wks. July 5- Aug. 26	German Spanish	Sec. Sec.	37	36	1	$ 64,145
Hollins College Hollins College, Va.	Maurice W. Sullivan	8 wks. June 27- Aug. 21	French 2nd yr.	Sec.	50	50	0	$ 72,235
University of Kansas Lawrence, Kans.	Agnes M. Brady	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	German Spanish	Elem. Elem.	64	63	1	$ 79,602
Louisiana State Univ. Baton Rouge, La.	John A. Thompson	8 wks. June 19- Aug. 13	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	69	61	8	$ 82,108
Univ. of Maine Orono, Maine	Wilmarth H. Starr	7 wks. July 6- Aug. 23	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec. Sec.	93	89	4	$109,668
Michigan State Univ. East Lansing, Mich.	Georges J. Joyaux	6 wks. June 21- Aug. 5	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	58	56	2	$ 75,621

TABLE III.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960 (CONTINUED)

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Univ. of Missouri Columbia, Mo.	John S. Brushwood	6 wks. June 18-July 29	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	60	60	0	$ 67,812
Montana State Univ. Missoula, Mont.	Robert M. Burgess	8 wks. June 20-Aug. 12	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	40	40	0	$ 62,707
Univ. of New Hampshire Durham, N. H.	R. Alberto Casás	6 wks. June 27-Aug. 5	French German	Sec. Elem.	40	40	0	$ 48,813
Univ. of North Dakota Grand Forks, N.D.	Norman Levin	8 wks. June 13-Aug. 5	French German	Sec. Sec.	42	40	2	$ 60,520
Northwestern Univ. Evanston, Ill.	C. R. Goedsche	8 wks. June 27-Aug. 19	German Russian	Sec. Sec.	56	52	4	$ 73,940
Univ. of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Ind.	James M. Spillane	6 wks. June 20-July 29	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	40	20	20	$ 45,352
Univ. of Oklahoma Norman, Okla.	Jim P. Artman	8 wks. June 6-July 29	Spanish	Sec.	40	40	0	$ 57,867
Univ. of Oregon Eugene, Ore.	David M. Dougherty	7 wks. June 27-Aug. 12	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	60	55	5	$ 82,391

TABLE III.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960 (CONTINUED)

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Univ. of Puerto Rico Río Piedras, P.R.	Margot Arce de Vázquez	6 wks. June 15 July 27	Spanish 2nd yr.	Sec.	45	45	0	$ 65,506
Purdue Univ. Lafayette, Ind.	Don H. Walther	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	59	54	5	$ 83,318
Rosary College River Forest, Ill.	Sister M. Grégoire	6 wks. June 27- Aug. 5	French Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	60	30	30	$ 55,455
Stanford University Palo Alto, Calif. (at Bad Boll, Ger.)	F.W. Strothmann	9 wks. June 19- Aug. 19	German 2nd yr.	Sec.	78	78	0	$115,035
Temple University Philadelphia, Penn.	James D. Powell	6 wks. June 27- Aug. 5	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	60	55	5	$ 72,654
Univ. of Tennessee Knoxville, Tenn.	Walter R. Heilman	6 wks. June 13- July 22	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	43	43	0	$ 54,100
University of Texas Austin, Texas	Ernest F. Haden	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	German Spanish	Sec. Sec.	59	57	2	$ 94,369
Tufts University Medford, Mass.	Seymour O. Simches	6 wks. June 27- Aug. 5	French Spanish	Elem. Elem.	40	37	3	$ 43,200

TABLE III.--SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1960 (CONCLUDED)

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Utah State Univ. Logan, Utah	M. L. Nielsen	6 wks. June 13- July 22	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	37	37	0	$ 48,443
Virginia State Coll. Petersburg, Va.	William T. Carter	8 wks. June 13- Aug. 6	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	42	42	0	$ 62,292
Washington Univ. St. Louis, Mo.	Milan S. La Du	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	French German	Elem. and Sec. Sec.	49	49	0	$ 69,204
University of Washington, Seattle, Wn.	Richard F. Wilkie	8 wks. June 17- Aug. 11	French German	Sec. Sec.	60	56	4	$ 84,140
Univ. of Wisconsin Madison, Wisc.	Russell P. Sebold	8 wks. June 20- Aug. 12	French Spanish	Sec. Sec.	56	56	0	$ 86,650

TABLE IV.--ACADEMIC YEAR INSTITUTES, 1960-61

Name of Institution	Institute Director	Duration	Languages taught	School level	Total Participants	Public School tchrs	Private School tchrs	Cost
Emory University Atlanta, Ga.	Oscar Haac	37 wks. Sept. 20 1960 - June 1 1961	French	Sec.	18	16	2	$108,512
Indiana University Bloomington, Ind.	William B. Edgerton	36 wks. Sept. 15 1960 - May 25 1961	Russian	Sec.	25	25	0	$140,519
Kent State Univ. Kent, Ohio	Adolf E. Schroeder	38 wks. Sept. 15 1960 - June 10 1961	German	Sec.	21	21	0	$122,190
Univ. of New Mexico Albuquerque, N. M.	R. M. Duncan	37 wks. Sept. 16 1960 - June 3 1961	Spanish	Elem. and Sec.	30	30	0	$144,504
Pennsylvania State Univ University Park, Pa.	Simon Belasco	38 wks. Sept. 14 1960 - June 5 1961	French	Sec.	23	22	1	$124,217

TABLE V.--ENROLLMENTS BY LANGUAGE AND LEVEL

LANGUAGE	SUMMER 1959		ACADEMIC YR 59-60		SUMMER 1960		ACADEMIC YR 60-61		TOTAL
	ELEM.	SEC.	ELEM.	SEC.	ELEM.	SEC.	ELEM.	SEC.	
FRENCH	30	341	16	18	110	735	--	41	1291
GERMAN	10	130	--	--	36	261	--	21	458
ITALIAN	--	--	--	--	--	28	--	--	28
RUSSIAN	--	39	--	19	--	66	--	25	149
SPANISH	19	351	9	20	125	652	6	24	1206
TOTALS	59	861	25	57	271	1742	6	111	3132

TABLE VI.--EVALUATION SURVEY TEAMS

SUMMER 1959	SUMMER 1960
Stephen A. Freeman, Vice-President Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont, Director	Stephen A. Freeman, Vice-President Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont, Director
Mary P. Thompson, Glastonbury Public Schools, Glastonbury, Connecticut, Asst. Director	John B. Archer, St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire
Jeannette Atkins, Westport Connecticut Public Schools	Joseph Axelrod, San Francisco State College
Arthur H. Beattie, University of Arizona	Arthur H. Beattie, University of Arizona
Agnes M. Brady, University of Kansas	Guillermo del Olmo, Yale University
William T. Carter, Virginia State College	Archibald T. MacAllister, Princeton University
Patricia O'Connor, Brown University	Robert G. Mead, University of Connecticut; editor HISPANIA
J. Alan Pfeffer, University of Buffalo; editor the MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL	Filomena Peloro, Hackensack, New Jersey, Public Schools
W. Freeman Twaddell, Brown University	J. Alan Pfeffer, University of Buffalo; editor the MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL
George B. Watts, Davidson College	George A. C. Scherer, University of Colorado
	Laurel H. Turk, De Pauw University
	George B. Watts, Davidson College